National Anti-Slavery Standard.

SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, EDITOR.

Without Concealment—Without Compromise.

EDMUND QUINCY, JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL, COR. EDITORS

VOL. XII. NO. 50.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, MAY 6, 1852.

WHOLE NO. 622.

Published weekly, on Thursday, by the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, at their office, No. 142 NASSAU STREET, NEW-YORK. Terms, TWO DOLLARS per annum. Printed for the American Anti-Slavery Society, by NORRIS & JOHNSTON, printers, No. 21 Spruce street.

Pro-Slavery.

ADDRESS

TO THE WHIGS OF THE UNITED STATES.

THE undersigned, members of the Thirty-second Congress of the United States, address you under an imperious sense of duty. Events have occurred at this Capitol within the last twenty days which are worthy of your serious and immediate consideration. They are likely to affect the future unity of the Whig party, as they have already disturbed the harmony of its members. We desire to state them accurately, that you may estimate their tendency and force correctly. A plain narrative of facts, in proper connection, will accomplish this purpose, and will serve, at the same time, to impart a correct conception of our own motives and conduct.

In the early part of this month, at a meeting of Senators, it was determined to invite a consultation between the Whigs of the Senate and House of Representatives. Who initiated this movement, or for what purpose, is known from the following notice, which was published in the newspapers of this City on the 7th day of April, 1852, by direction of Hon. Willie P. Mangum, of North Carolina:

"THE WHIG MEMBERS OF CONGRESS are requested to meet at the Senate Chamber on Friday evening next, the 8th inst., at 7 o'clock, to consider of matters of importance to the Whig party.
"*Wednesday, April* 7, 1852."

At the time and place suggested by the notice, some sixty-eight members of the two Houses assembled. Mr. Mangum was called to the Chair, and Messrs. Chandler and Dockery were appointed Secretaries. Before any distinct proposition was submitted to the consideration of the meeting, after the statement from the Chair, a motion was made to adjourn to a subsequent day, that a more numerous attendance of the Whig members of Congress might be obtained. Remarks were made by several gentlemen indicative of a desire to limit the attention of the meeting to the single object of determining the time and place for a National Convention to select Whig candidates for the Presidency and the Vice Presidency. And it was urged that the most important results might flow from the determination of the time and place for the Convention, as each point was calculated to affect the nomination. It was then suggested (by Mr. Marshall, of Kentucky) that it was deemed material the meeting should pass upon another proposition before proceeding to determine time and place for the National Convention—a proposition which affected the persons to exercise the right of determining the time and place for holding the Convention. He observed that, at the commencement of this session of Congress, certain gentlemen had retired from a meeting of Whig Representatives, because that meeting refused to lay on the table a resolution indorsing the position of the present Administration upon the series of measures known as the "the Compromise measures"—that some of the same persons had, during the session, publicly assailed the said resolution as an untrue expression of Whig sentiment in regard to those measures—and that these persons were present now to assist in determining the time and place for the Whig National Convention. Considering the position of the Administration on this class of questions, the condition of political parties, and the fact that, by some, the resolution referred to was deemed cardinal as a principle, it was thought by many to be the proper course to restate, in the meeting of the Whig Members of the two Houses, the position which the Whigs in Congress hold on the Compromise measures, before proceeding to the steps preparatory for a Convention of the Whig party. He then remarked that, before the time and place for holding the National Convention were determined, he designed to submit a resolution to the meeting embodying the principle proclaimed by the Whig Congressional Caucus of December last; and he hoped all present, to participate in the proceedings, would agree to the same.

This view was met by the argument, from one quarter, that the Whig members of Congress were only authorized to fix the time and place for the National Convention; and therefore any resolution to test political opinion was beyond their province to consider in the meeting. In another quarter it was argued that the attempt to harmonize the opinions of Whigs on the Compromise measures or their effect, or upon the questions springing from the institution of Slavery, was useless; that the proper course was "to agree to disagree" where radical differences were known to exist, and that true policy required all to abstain from effort to engraft new principles upon the long-established creed of the party, leaving every section to think and to act at will where a common platform was inaccessible.

The debate was participated in by several gentlemen, and we only seek to state the points of it. The Chairman remarked that before submitting the question of adjournment, he felt bound to say that, should the resolution indicated by the member from Kentucky be offered at the next meeting, the Chair would refuse to entertain it, and should decide it to be out of order. This statement the Chairman made in advance, that gentlemen dissatisfied with the view entertained by the Chair might proceed to select some one else to preside.

The annunciation of a foregone determination by the Chairman to limit the subjects to which attention might be directed in a meeting convened under a general notice to consult on matters of importance to the Whig party, and this refusal in advance, to consider a political proposition, which is, in the opinion of many, vital to the Union and essential to the integrity of the Whig party, at once invested the future action of this Congressional consultation with an interest and importance that had not theretofore attached to it. The assumption of the Chair was met by instant remonstrance. The right to present the resolution was pressed now as a point of principle, and notice was given that at the next meeting it would be insisted upon. On this issue the meeting was adjourned to the 20th day of April.

At the appointed hour, on the evening of the 20th of April, the Hon. W. P. Mangum called the meeting to order. So soon as the Journal was read, Hon. Edward Stanly, of North Carolina offered the following resolution:

Resolved, That it be recommended to hold the Whig National Convention in the City of Baltimore, in the State of Maryland, on Wednesday, the 16th day of June next, for the purpose of nominating candidates for President and Vice President of the United States."

Mr. MARSHALL, of Kentucky, immediately presented the resolution of which notice had been given at the former meeting, and asked that it might be adopted as a substitute for the proposition of the gentleman from North Carolina. It is in these words:

"Whereas, The determination of the time and place for holding a National Whig Convention has been referred to the Whigs of Congress, the Whig members of the Senate and House of Representatives having assembled in Convention with the explicit understanding that they 'regard the series of acts known as the Adjustment Measures as forming in their mutual dependence and connection a system of compromise the most conciliatory and the best for the entire country that could be obtained from conflicting sectional interests and opinions; and that, therefore, they ought to be adhered to and carried into faithful execution, as a final settlement, in principle and substance, of the dangerous and exciting subjects which they embrace,' and do unite on this basis as well as upon the long-established principles of the Whig party, do hereby recommend the — day of —— and the city of —— as the time and place of holding the National Whig Convention for the choice of Whig candidates for the Presidency and Vice Presidency respectively."

Mr. STANLY objected to the introduction of the substitute, because it was out of order. The Chairman sustained the objection. Mr. Marshall appealed from the decision of the Chair. Mr. Stanly moved that the appeal lie on the table. An informal debate ensued, which was cut off by a decision of the Chair, that all discussion was out of order unless strictly confined to the question of order. The vote was then taken by Ayes and Noes on the question, "Shall the appeal from the decision of the Chair lie on the table?" and it was decided in the affirmative—Ayes 46, Noes 21. The following will exhibit the names of the gentlemen who voted, and their respective localities:

YEAS—*Maine*—Goodenow, Washburn; *Vermont*—Hebard, Meacham; *Massachusetts*—John Davis, Fowler, Goodrich, Scudder; *Connecticut*—T. Smith, Chapman; *Rhode Island*—Clarke, G. G. King; *New York*—Fish, Bowne, Briggs, Hascall, Horsford, Sackett, Schoolcraft, Walbridge, Wells; *New Jersey*—Miller; *Pennsylvania*—Allison, Chandler, T. M. Howe, J. W. Howe, Kuhns, Moore; *Delaware*—Spruance; *Ohio*—Wade, Barrere, L. D. Campbell, Hunter, B. Stanton, Taylor; *Indiana*—Parker, Brenton; *Illinois*—Yates; *Michigan*—Penniman; *Kentucky*—Underwood, Grey, Ward; *Missouri*—Porter; *Tennessee*—Cullom; *North Carolina*—Morehead, Stanly. Total, 46.

NOES—*Massachusetts*—Appleton; *New York*—Brooks, Haws, Haven, Schermerhorn, Martin; *Pennsylvania*—Cooper; *Virginia*—Strother; *Kentucky*—Ewing, Marshall, White; *Tennessee*—Gentry, Williams; *North Carolina*—Clingman, Dockery, Outlaw; *Louisiana*—J. Moore, Landry; *Florida*—Morton, Cabell; *Mississippi*—Brooke. Total, 21.

When the result was announced several of the undersigned formally withdrew from the meeting. Mr. Gentry, of Tennessee, then submitted the following, to be added *as an amendment* to the resolution offered by Mr. Stanly:

"Resolved, That the Whig members of Congress, in thus recommending a time and place for the National Whig Convention to assemble, are not to be understood as pledging themselves to support the nominee of said Convention, except upon the condition that the persons then and there nominated as candidates for President and Vice President shall be publicly and unequivocally pledged to regard the series of measures known as the Compromise Measures as a final settlement of the dangerous questions which they embraced, and to maintain that settlement inviolate."

Objection was made to the introduction of this amendment, *because it was out of order*. The Chair sustained the objection. An appeal was taken from the decision of the Chair; and after some debate, the meeting sustained the ruling of the Chair. Thereupon, the remainder of the undersigned formally withdrew from the meeting.

It is officially announced that, after our withdrawal, the resolution of Mr. Stanly was passed; and then the meeting adjourned.

The foregoing statement exhibits the character and order of the proceedings, which compelled the undersigned to leave the meeting of the 20th inst.

By a reference to the list of persons who participated in these proceedings, it will be perceived there was a great disparity in the representation from the free States and the slaveholding States. We are authorized to state that several gentlemen from the slaveholding States, belonging to the Whig party, declined to participate at all in a meeting of which the result was palpable, under the intimations of purpose advanced by the Chairman at the first meeting.

The meeting was composed of forty-six gentlemen from the free States, and twenty-one from the slaveholding States. The vote is divided, forty-six to twenty-one—seven from each class of States voting with the opposing section.

The entire meeting was a meager majority of the representation classed as Whig in the Congress of the United States. The quota from the slaveholding States remaining in the meeting after our withdrawal was just one-fourth of the Whig representation from the slaveholding States. The determination of the time and place for the Whig National Convention may therefore justly be considered as made by the Congressional Representatives from the free States.

Of the members of Congress from the free States present and acting in this meeting, a large majority were committed by legislative action, against the Compromise measures at their passage, or have refused to express an intention to maintain and execute them since their passage. Among those who took these proceedings were some of the most conspicuous opponents of the Adjustment and most active agitators of the North. Of the thirty-one Representatives from the free States, who voted affirmatively on the proposition that the appeal do lie on the table, only *three* had recorded their votes in favour of the passage of Hillyer's resolution at this session, expressing as the sense of the country that the Compromise measures should be maintained as a final settlement of the questions they embraced, and should be fairly and honestly executed. Nineteen had voted against that resolution. Nine were absent. These, united to the vote of the Senators, would have been sufficient to overpower the whole representation present from the slaveholding States, had that representation been united. We will not dwell upon the considerations these facts suggest, or express the reflections which they naturally awaken. It is apparent, however, that the time and place have been determined, not only by a minority of the Whig representation, but by a preponderance of that element of the representation which either opposed the Adjustment or disavows the "finality" of the settlement.

The undersigned now invite a review of their own course as connected with this Congressional consultation. We shall pass over without comment the evident predetermination of the Chairman to guide the meeting to a fixed result, by confining it to the consideration of such subjects as suited his own inclinations and purposes. We presume this will be manifest to every one, from the determination he announced in advance to rule Mr. Marshall's resolution out of order, even as an original substantive proposition. By what parliamentary law or common usage does the Chairman of a meeting limit the business thereof to a single question, when no limitation is expressed in the notice under which it is assembled? Does the objection lie in the fact that the members present were to be called upon to express their sentiments as to the propriety of maintaining and enforcing the Compromise measures? We leave you to judge.

What reason can be rendered for the decision that the resolution *was out of order*? It differed from Mr. Stanly's in one particular only. In addition to the determination of the time and place for holding the National Convention, Marshall's resolution suggested the Congressional caucus resolution of December, 1851, as a condition precedent to the union of the Whig members of Congress in the approaching canvass. It did not attempt to prescribe a platform for the National Convention, or to dictate to the delegates from the primary assemblies of the people. It avowed the determination of its friends to remain uncommitted and to abstain altogether from taking steps initiatory to a National Whig Convention, unless the condition was satisfactorily met. It was not inconsistent with Stanly's resolution, but cumulative thereto by the imposition of a condition affecting only the actors in this Congressional meeting, and, impliedly, relieving them from a committal to sustain the nominees of a convention which might fail to require the same condition of its candidates. It did not dictate or seek to dictate the programme of the National Convention; but merely asserted an affirmative endorsement of "the finality of the Compromise" as a basis of union among the present Whig members of Congress. Was that improper? Can the Whig members of this Congress, who claim to be national in their feelings, unite upon a candidate on any other basis? Ought National Whigs anywhere, North or South, to agree for a moment to forego a point so vital to the preservation of the peace of society? We did ardently desire the Whigs in Congress to adopt the proposition as a conclusion of their own, and to publish it to the country as one of the bonds of their political association. It required no sacrifice of principle—no recantation of opinion—no renunciation of error; only a determination—consistent with the noblest impulses of patriotism—to abide for the future by a settlement designed to restore peace to a distracted country, and to carry into execution honestly the compacts of the Constitution. We frankly state, that it was our deliberate purpose to announce at the threshold an unalterable determination to aid in no scheme for an election associated with or allied to men whose policy it was to *ignore* the final settlement of those dangerous and exciting questions which are embraced by what is termed "the Adjustment." With the candor of freemen we presented in the proposition submitted to the meeting the position to which we shall adhere. We rest its vindication upon the fact that it was assumed from a solemn sense of duty to ourselves and to our country; and we rely for a justification of our course in these proceedings upon the honest impulses of the people, and the patriotism of all who love the Union, and wish to perpetuate its blessings.

To assert the converse of our proposition—"to agree to disagree" on questions connected with the institution of Slavery, as it is recognized by the Constitution, on the Fugitive Slave Law and the finality of the Compromise—is to open willingly the sources of the most noxious agitation, and to reveal the means of assailing anew the harmony, and, mayhap, the existence of the Union. Have the dissensions of the past inculcated no moral? Shall the progress and peace of the future be marred by the renewed efforts of a fanaticism which halts at no barrier erected by mortal power, and exultingly proclaims its obedience only to a power higher than human law? Shall the ties that link the various parts of a noble country together yield to the force of a demagoguism which wears the mask of liberty only to perpetuate crime; or that it may, with comparative impunity, excite passion, to reward ultimately a desire for self-aggrandizement? Will the Whig party, *under existing circumstances*, shroud honest convictions of public duty in silence, that our candidate for the proudest honour of earth may have his opinions interpreted variously to suit the changing prejudice or prepossessions of particular latitudes? Fellow-Whigs! such a policy will not—should not succeed. It is unworthy of a great party whose sentiments are conservative, and whose aim is the prosperity and happiness of the people. Its tendency is to reduce the Whig party to a mere heterogeneous compound of discordant sectional factions; the ballot-box to a receptacle for votes obtained by fraud upon one or other of the sections of the United States; and the Presidential election to a trial of chicanery and dissimulation among political mountebanks. We do not seek to make an injurious ascription of motive to any man or association of men; but we repudiate and refuse, for our part, now and hereafter, to lend our support to any candidate whose principles are not plainly defined, or to join in any crusade against popular rights, the honesty of politics, or the palpable interest of the country, for the purpose of achieving a temporary political triumph.

But, to return. What was the ingredient in Gentry's amendment that induced the Chairman to rule *it* out of order? The only aim of the amendment was to exclude a conclusion. It was framed distinctly with a view to absolve the Whig members present from an implied pledge to support the nominees of the National Convention, "unless those nominees shall be publicly and unequivocally pledged to regard the series of measures known as the Compromise measures as a final settlement of the dangerous questions they embraced and to maintain them inviolate." What inference can be drawn from the refusal to grant this exemption but that the determination existed to commit all who participated in the meeting to the support of the nominee of the National Convention, whether he shall be pledged to support the Compromise or not? Some of the undersigned are bound by our solemn public declaration, made in 1850, that we will support no man for office unless he is known, unequivocally and beyond controversy, to be determined to maintain, support and execute the laws known as the Compromise measures—Fugitive Slave Law and all. We shall religiously redeem our word. We felt, after the defeat of Gentry's amendment, that silence or acquiescence, under the circumstances, would commit us to an inconsistency, and justly awaken suspicion of our sincerity. Regarding the vote on Gentry's amendment as the emphatic declaration by the meeting either that the persons present remained uncommitted as to their own support of the Adjustment measures, or that they refused to establish any such test of the qualification of the nominee of the National Convention, no course remained, consistent with our conviction of duty and sense of self-respect, but to withdraw formally from the meeting, and to retain the position we designed to retain.

It has been charged that it is our deliberate purpose to distract the counsels of the Whigs, and to create an unnecessary schism in the body of the Whig party. It has been charged that our object is to open afresh the agitation upon the Slavery questions, and to create sectional strife, in order to prevent a concentration of Whig strength at the approaching Presidential election. It has been charged that we present insulting terms to the North by requiring the reiteration of pledges to maintain and to enforce laws which exist on the statute-book, and which no Member of Congress or political aspirant has manifested an intention to disturb. These statements, fellow-Whigs, are unjust and untrue. If any schism shall occur in the Whig party, it will result from the attempts of men whose present distinction is alone attributable to the success with which they have heretofore fed the flames of sectional fanaticism, and whose future hopes rest mainly upon the creation of sectional divisions. Our effort has been to induce the Whigs to assume a national ground—a conservative and patriotic position—the only position upon which the statesman and the patriot can maintain the harmony of these States, or preserve the existence of this Government.

So far from opening agitation upon the Slavery questions, our avowed object is, and the effect of the proposition we assert must be, to terminate agitation by assuming as a starting point for the canvass that the entire party, North and South, faithfully abides by the law as it exists, and maintains the Compromise measures as a final settlement of the exciting questions they embrace. How is it possible that this position can afford a basis for renewed agitation, *unless there is a determination not to abide by that settlement?* The principle we assert may be avowed as consistently by opponents of the Compromise measures as by those whose exertions enacted them. When partners have litigated questions arising in their former dealing, and a decree has been rendered, asserting the true state of their account, would it be considered insulting or unfair that, in opening new books, one should demand of the other that the decree be accepted as the basis on which they renew business? Would the answer be considered satisfactory, "You have your decree—enforce it if you can; but do not require an acknowledgment of its justice, by compelling me to assert that I will abide by it?" Had two neighbours disagreed and referred their respective claims to arbitrators, does the loser forfeit dignity by acknowledging the award and renewing business upon the basis thereof? These homely illustrations point to the view we take of the present duties of all patriots in this Government. The original compacts of the Constitution established the terms of this Confederacy, and constitute the organic law of Government. After a series of years, sectional disputes arose, and the Missouri Compromise was made to quiet controversy relating to certain governmental powers and constitutional questions.

It was faithfully executed by the United States, and submitted to by the people of the slaveholding States. After another series of years new acquisitions of territory were made—new disputes arose touching the same powers and the same question. A new Compromise was made, whereby the balance of power was yielded by the slaveholding States, and the reigns of empire were delivered up to the free States by the admission of California into the Union. The Slave Trade was suppressed in the District of Columbia, Territorial Governments were created over the whole public domain, and an act was passed to enforce the delivery of fugitives from labour. This settlement being made, has the South murmured at the law suppressing the Slave Trade in this District? Look upon the opposite picture. Reply to your own hearts, how has the law for the delivery of fugitive slaves been executed? We ask merely that the Whig party shall not go behind this last settlement—that it shall nationalize itself by taking a firm and true position upon the finality of this settlement, and shall hold its members bound, without regard to former opinions, to maintain and enforce this settlement in good faith, and honestly. To this end we did desire the declaration to this effect to come from the distinguished gentlemen who assembled in the Capitol, under the hope that the country would enthusiastically respond to it. We have been disappointed in the realization of our wish, and, because of the effort, we have been arraigned by anonymous employées of the press, and our motives impugned by political leaders, athwart whose policy lies our own course, and, as we solemnly believe, the true direction for the public good. What would be the effect of a refusal to endorse the position we have assumed? What will be the result of a failure to respond to the principle we have asserted? Neither more nor less than the inglorious and deserved defeat of the Whig candidate for the Presidency, because the platform of the party will be too narrow for the patriotism of the people. They will demand one as broad as the interests of the whole Union.

Should both of the great political parties fail to shape future party organization upon the enlarged and fair principle to which we invited the Whig meeting at the Capitol on the 20th inst., there remains but one other resort. The people will demand such an organization at the expense of existing parties, and it will triumph over both; or, misled by political leaders, whose personal ambition rises above their love of country, the people will become involved in a canvass conducted by candidates whose parasites will pander to sectional prejudices, and will seek political preferment by arousing sectional passions. The next Congress, in that case, will be composed of men of all parties pledged to renew the agitation of questions which the XXXIst Congress closed with so much difficulty. The result of such a struggle human foresight cannot compass. We have believed that intelligent statesmanship, by timely action and patriotic effort, could avoid the trial and the catastrophe. We made an honest effort to point the way. We have now explained our motive and our conduct, and we confidently submit them for your judgment.

The events of the Congressional meeting of 20th April are of significant import. It does not become the undersigned to suggest your course in view of them. Our object is accomplished by inviting to them your immediate consideration, satisfied, as we are, that they will awaken your serious reflection, and guide you to such action as may be demanded by the duties to the present and the hopes of the future.

W. BROOKE, Mississippi,
JACKSON MORTON, Florida,
JOHN MOORE, Louisiana,
HUMPHREY MARSHALL, Kentucky,
M. P GENTRY, Tennessee,
C. H. WILLIAMS, Tennessee,
E. C. CABELL, Florida,
DAVID OUTLAW, North Carolina,
J. ARISTIDE LANDRY, Louisiana,
JAMES F. STROTHER, Virginia.

I fully concur in the statement of facts, as well as the general positions of this Address.
T. L. CLINGMAN, North Carolina.

THE "PECULIAR INSTITUTION" has many phases, and is sometimes manifested as clearly and unequivocally in the lashing of a dough-face as in the whipping of a slave. We give below a full report, from the *Washington Union*, of a recent incident of the former sort in the National Legislature, in which it is pleasant to see with what good will the lash is applied to a Northern miscreant who has been bought, but who ventures to hint that he may never get his pay; and pitiful to hear his appeals to his masters for mercy on the score of how faithful a hound he always has been, and always means to be.

SPEECH OF MR. MANGUM,

In the United States Senate, April 22, 1852.

Mr. MANGUM. I desire again to throw myself on the indulgence of the Senate for the space of five minutes. When a man begins to speak of himself, he generally becomes garrulous, and occupies a good deal of time; but I will be very short, Mr. President; I will limit myself to five minutes.

The PRESIDENT. It requires unanimous consent.

Several SENATORS. Go on.

Mr. MANGUM. A newspaper was placed in my hands, by a friend, yesterday—a paper that I am not accustomed to read—in which I find a violent, unjustifiable, and a most atrociously injurious personal assault upon me. Here it is:

WASHINGTON, April 17.

The presidential movements here continue to be the engrossing topics, and they absorb all other matters of interest. It is in vain to disguise facts, and to face them always is true heroism.

An impression prevails—be it true or not, it is yet the impression—that Mr. Senator Mangum made the speech in the Senate he has made in consequence of the lure of the Vice Presidency on the Scott ticket; and an impression prevails that a like lure is held out to Mr. Senator Jones, of Tennessee, in consequence of which is the division manifested among the Southern Whigs in Congress. I must not be censured for writing you of the existence of this impression. I did not create it. It is my bounden duty, as your correspondent, to write you not only facts, but wide-spread rumours affecting public men; and when these rumours are put by me into print, I but confer an obligation in giving them a reason to contradict in public what is everywhere whispering in private. The rumour and the belief among many, therefore, are, that at supper parties and at dinner parties a coalition has been formed between *Mr. Mangum* and *ex-Governor Seward* on one side, involving others on their respective sides—that with General Scott, as the unwriting or unwritten candidate for the North, is to be run Mr. MANGUM South; or Mr. JONES, with the distribution of other high offices among their followers in North Carolina, and Tennessee, and Kentucky. Hence this astonishing coalition!

Mr. Mangum was selected, rumour adds, to preside over the Whig Congressional Caucus at a private meeting, where Governor Seward was the presiding spirit, and it was there determined that the Whig compromise resolution of the first congressional caucus should be ruled out of order. All this may be most untrue, and I endorse not one word of it; but such rumours are as current in the Washington circles as any item of news in circulation. I have before me names of men alleged to have been present at these private dinner and supper caucuses, but it is not my business to invade social circles further than as they produce public measures. The Scott speeches agreed upon in these caucuses to follow Mr. Mangum, from Tennessee and North Carolina, and to back him up, will soon tell what I need not write.

It is agreed, too—and Mr. Mangum's speech already discloses it—that the Whig compromise resolution of the early congressional caucus is to be repudiated, not only for the coming congressional caucus, by being ruled out of order, but in the Whig National Convention, repudiated as uncalled for and unnecessary also. Some of the Southern Whigs in this new movement insist upon it, that the waiving of the issue now is but its adjournment to a more fitting body—the Whig National Convention—and such of them as are in earnest (for some of them are) are but dupes, as dupes they should be. The whole Compromise, as a "finality," is to have the go-by, then, in the convention, and such is the supper-and-dinner-caucus understanding among the high-contracting parties; and the go-by it will have and should have in the present position of things. *Why?* I think I hear you ask, in astonishment. WHY? Hear me, then, and I will tell you why.

We Northern Whigs can never fight for Southern constitutional rights on Northern ground if Southern men abandon us. The provision in the constitution for the surrender of fugitive slaves is to me a most unpopular, often a most revolting and shocking duty; but it is a duty imposed upon us by the constitution, and as sacred, solemn a part of that instrument as any other section in it. If such leading men as Mangum, Stanly, Jones, of Tennessee, or any portion of Kentucky, even abandon us when we struggle in the North for the unquestioned, unquestionable rights of the Southern States, we must fall before the unpopularity of the fugitive slave provision of the constitution. We cannot stand up for men who refuse to stand up for themselves. We have no earthly interest in protecting the odious parts of the constitution, surrendered by the South itself. We will never be the catchers of negroes that North Carolina men or Kentucky men do not want. If we can evade that provision of the constitution by Southern acquiescence, we most assuredly will. Slave-catching, next to slave-trading, is thought by most people to be the meanest of all occupations. We Whigs who, in the North, have sacrificed ourselves, our popularity, our power, to preserve the consecrated instrument a George Washington and a John Adams bequeathed us, are absolved from all obligations to continue this self-sacrifice when such men as Messrs. Mangum, Stanly, Jones, and others, acting for their States, acquit us from the contract.

And why should we continue this sacrifice? Answer ye me that, Messrs. Editors. You have given the country from Western New York an Anti-Slavery man for President, whose education, every feeling of whose nature, beyond all doubt, was and is Anti-Slavery, but who, upon becoming President, and taking the oath faithfully to administer the government under the constitution, remembered there was a South as well as a North, and who now, for this remembrance only, is assailed by all the violence of Abolition, assisted even in this assault by such men as Mr. Mangum in his echoes of what they say, viz.: that Mr. Fillmore is unavailable among the Whigs of the North, and they demand his immolation therefor. This Southern man admits, in his own State, that Mr. Fillmore is preferred above all others; but he advances the extra judicial *dictum* that he is not available in the land of his boyhood and birth, and that the State which has hitherto crowned him with its highest honours will now turn its back upon him. Why, however, it may be asked, I suppose, can he not carry Northern Whig votes—an averment, by the way, as unfounded as cruel in Mr. Mangum's mouth—why (if admitted), *because he has been faithful to the constitution and to the South*, as well as to the North. We see in Mr. Fillmore, therefore (and the same may be said of Mr. Webster, for their course is one), Northern men sacrificed by Southern men—and sacrificed by Southern men, too, because, in obedience to their oaths to support the constitution, they have supported in good faith that provision of it which secures the rights of the South.

The path of duty, therefore, for Northern national Whigs, if Mr. Mangum and his followers persist in their course, and are satisfied at home, or even by divisions at home, is clear; and that path is, to let the South take care of itself, its fugitive slaves and all. If Southern men encourage the reopening or the keeping open the Anti-Slavery issues, why, let the reopening come, and if Slavery be an institution that cannot stand the test of law, or religion, or popular opinion, it must tumble down. If Mr. Mangum can embrace in caucus, Governor Seward, fresh from the Bloomer Anti-Slavery demonstrations of Auburn, and Thaddeus Stevens, with hands red with the blood of the Gorsuch murder in Christiana, without any definition of principles—nay, declaring them all *as out of order*—why cannot you, the editors of the *Express?* I see no reason why you Northern Whigs, who, as forlorn hopes, have led on even the Democratic columns from the errors of the Wilmot proviso to the defence of the constitution and the laws, should act as forlorn hopes any more. When the Southern generals-in-chief are deserting you on the field of battle, you would be fools to be leading forlorn hopes in their behalf. There are periods in politics, as in war, when to surrender is a duty as well as discretion. I counsel no surrender now, however, but more vigilant action than ever until it is settled whether Mr. Mangum leads, or even divides, the South. New York and New England Whigs of the national faith should stand by their principles, and such exponents of them as Mr. Fillmore and Mr. Webster, as long as the Southern Whigs are true in mass; but if the Southern Whig regiment even stagger, or begin to stagger, *sauve qui peut* be the cry. Mr. Mangum, however, it is believed, will soon be put *hors du combat*.

General Scott will certainly be nominated President in the Whig National Convention, if the Southern Whigs divide between him and any Northern man; and of that there can be no doubt; or, *vice versa*, if the Southern Whigs are united, Mr. Fillmore or Mr. Webster will be the man. If General Scott is nominated on Mr. Mangum's programme, it is wisely calculated, in these dinner or supper caucuses of which I have been speaking, that he can carry the Northern States, with some (one only) Southern State. Even such a State as Maryland is given up on the canvass I have seen! Ohio, Pennsylvania, and New York, with their solid columns, are set down for him sure! North Carolina, Tennessee, and Louisiana, are utterly sacrificed in this calculation. It is felt and known that, with such able men from Tennessee speaking, as Mr. Gentry is reported to have spoken the other night, in the Whig caucus, or such as Mr. Outlaw, of North Carolina, speaking with the energy he is reported to have done, there can be no possible hope of these States.

Mr. Mangum's programme, therefore, is a wise one: *utter abandonment of the compromise bills, and the permission to run General Scott in the free States, with the repeal or virtual annulment of the fugitive slave law upon every Whig banner.* His strength in the free States will be determined by the candidate the Democracy run against him; but it is obvious already that in Ohio, central and western New York, Abolition Democracy will beat Whig Abolition in this scheme two to one. The best Whig districts in Ohio have been cut out by demagoguing Democratic Abolition; and in this race of demagoguing there is nothing that can equal, much less eclipse, such men as Rantoul in New England, or the Chase and Giddings Free Democracy of Ohio.

I have no right to advise you, Messrs. Editors, but the programme I have marked out for myself I may ask you to publish for others to see. As a Northern man I shall go—nay, I must go—with the Northern Whig party, even with this threatened new inscription of it: "*The practical nullification of the fugitive slave section of the constitution;*" simply because I have nowhere else to go, save into the arms of a Democracy, three-fourths of whose presses in the State in which I reside go for the very same thing, and almost everything else besides. No single man, or set of men, can breast the flood of Abolitionism when such men as Mr. Mangum take away their dykes. He who attempts it would only be drowned in some Zuyder Zee. The Whig party is dear to me, and I cannot abandon it now, even with these its great faults, to cling to something worse. Gen. Scott, if nominated and elected by us, is a man whom, of himself, we can trust; and we must live as well as we can in the malaria or amid the influences that will have nominated and elected him. They doom us all to proscription, to utter proscription; we see, know, and feel, as like influences did under General Taylor; but what men suffer, are things unimportant, as long as a principle can be maintained. Parties are never perfect, and a man must make a choice of the best of them. Under Gen. Scott, as under Gen. Taylor, if Gen. Scott is faithful to the influences that make him President, Mr. Webster must hang again around ante-chambers, as he hung before, repulsed or frozen, and Mr. Fillmore must be sneered at as not having the power to get even a clerkship for a friend, or Mr. Clay be denounced, as denounced he was when he introduced his omnibus bill.

The future is big with events. No human being can foresee or control them. It seems to me an utter disruption of all old parties is portending.

AN EYE ON THE CAPITOL.

The following editorial article I find in the same paper which contains this letter—the *New York Evening Express*, of Tuesday, April 20:

"The letter from our occasional Washington correspondent to-day being of that kind which will probably create an excitement at the Capitol, we have, for the sake of peace, delayed its publication, so that it will not appear at the Capitol until after the meeting of the Whig caucus to-night. The writer, in some things, expresses our own views, and in others he does not. He argues his case ably, and with effect. Had he passed the whole winter at Washington, instead of a portion of it, his views might have been different; but being an independent citizen, and just as independent of the present administration and all its influences as of all candidates for the Presidency who hope to succeed the present administration, and above administering to any popular or official caprice, his views are as frankly given as they are strongly expressed.

"The tone of this letter leads us to apprehend that the Whig caucus this evening will not be harmonious; that Mr. Dawson, should he attend it, and some other Whig Senators from the South, should they be present, will leave the caucus, together with Messrs. Gentry, Marshall, Williams, Cabell, Landry, and other Representatives from the South. Messrs. Mangum, Jones, Stanly, Cullom of Tennessee, Grey of Maryland, and others, we judge, from recent public incidents and letters, will remain, and of course these will control the result.

"If Southern Whigs choose to divide upon such an issue as the compromise measures, it is not for us to complain. Upon the merits of these measures our views are unalterably fixed, and neither time nor circumstances can change them. It is, however, to be a source of deep mortification to see Whigs doubly disagreeing upon this question—first, as to its utility and justice; and, secondly, upon the propriety of sustaining it publicly. The enemies of the Compromise, especially at the North, are made happy by the state of facts; and if this is any source of gratification to either of the Southern Whig sections, we hope they will make much of it. It has, however, been so long the fashion for Northern Whigs to be divided upon the compromise questions, that perhaps we shall be rebuked for arraigning those at the South who now disagree as to their merits, and the propriety of sustaining them. We of the North, however, who have sustained these measures, have been made the pack-horses for all sorts of Free Soil abuse; and if there is a party at the South who prefer such alliances to others, we can have no sort of objection to the coalition. The full freedom of such fellowship may teach both sides more of charity towards different sections of country."

I do not notice these communications when they proceed from the usual organs of communications; but when there is internal evidence that they proceed from a higher official quarter, I may feel myself called on, as I now do, to stigmatize their falsehood, and brand their mendacity as they deserve, and to fix the burning brand upon the mendacious and sycophantic calumniator. In this letter to the *New York Express*, I am charged with a coalition with the Senator from New York, formed at "supper parties and dinner parties;" the reward of which coalition is to bring high officers to the "high contracting parties," and their friends respectively. Sir, every charge of coalition, preconcert, or agreement with that Senator, on any public question, I pronounce to be unqualifiedly and absolutely false. We are understood to agree on the Presidential question. On that I have not been deflected, for I stand now where I stood four years ago, as my colleague [Mr. Badger] well knows, and will be ready to verify on all proper occasions.

The author of the letter undertakes to assign motives to me—the desire of high office, &c. &c.—and yet is somewhat at fault to designate it. The only one named is indivisible, notwithstanding two gentlemen are named for it. The terms of the coalition are singularly inexplicit and indefinite. The calumniator is at fault—not in his dirty trade, but as to the stipulations contained in the coalition.

Another is still more serious. It represents me in the light of venality, as having been selected in a private caucus—the New York Senator being present, and a prominent person in it—to preside in a Congressional caucus to rule certain points of order to suit the views of these conspirators. This is equally false, as is well known to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Underwood], who nominated me in a caucus of the Whigs of the Senate as chairman; as he likewise did of the Congressional caucus; which passed on both occasions without dissent, and was done upon his own motion, and without consultation, as I presume, with any one.

With a proper respect for the Senator from New York, and estimate of his talents, he has as little influence on my opinions and my actions as any one in this body; and I think he would verify that, as matter of opinion, upon oath if required [laughter]. Sir, with regard to the charge of venality, I may say that I have had the honour of occupying, for several years, the high seat which you now so worthily and ably fill; and the last act of this body on my retirement, I look upon as the proudest honour ever conferred upon me; which was the unanimous vote of the Senate—with a majority in politics adverse to me, and when one objector could have arrested the proceeding—to give me the amount of salary fixed by law for a Vice President elected by the people. I suppose the gentleman who observed my course here for years, saw nothing like venality or conscious partiality; otherwise, such a result could not have been realized.

These are the material allegations. I believe they have been unwillingly, wittingly and wickedly made, with full knowledge or belief of their falsehood, on the part of him who made them; and these allegations and insinuations I here pronounce to be—in the aggregate and in detail, in the whole and in every part—and I do it under every responsibility, moral and otherwise, that a gentleman can assume—utterly and absolutely false and unfounded, so far as they affect my honour or my integrity. The insidious and skulking editorial, designed to screen the malignant miscreant, speaks of *an occasional correspondent!*—who has been here *but a part of the winter!*—otherwise, he might have had other impressions. The skulking hypocrite!—the base, cutthroat calumniator!

Sir, I have in my own mind no sort of doubt about the authorship. I have recently heard a speech in this chamber, not from a Senator, between which and portions of the letter to the *Express* there is a remarkable identity of sentiment, identity of language, and singular identity of coincidence in minute turns of phraseology. It is incredible that *both* did not proceed from the same forge which has hitherto turned out much base, uncurrent coin, and I have thought proper to notice and brand it with the stigma of base, unprovoked, deliberate, and deliberated falsehood so far as I am able to do so; and if the author can think of anything (as doubtless he can in his vocation) that will more strongly and pointedly express contempt and contumely on my part, he has, by these presents, a *carte blanche* from me to write it, and print it, too, in the *Express*—always with the reservation that he is neither to make me say nor insinuate that, in my opinion, the author has any essential element of a true gentleman. A half-way mendicant of an editor, who fishes up his dirty and dependent bread from the filthy pools of slander and calumny, may, in some sort, in some circumstances, be an object of pity, for "his poverty and not his will consents."

But when some freak of fortune shall throw an editor into a high official position, and he shall affect the loftiest airs of a brilliant court, and majestically roll in his splendid coach through the broad avenues of the capital of the Union—his official position serving as a passport to refined and virtuous, and the highest and most polished circles of society, it is always to be deplored to find him devoid of the principles, the sentiments, and the feelings of a gentleman; and when this passport enables him to find his way to "private suppers or dinner parties," and we find him prowling about for the means of picking up calumny and slanders or facts, as the case may be, in the way of his vocation, to minister to the rabid appetites of the readers of his press or *Express*, and thus abusing the hospitalities in which he unworthily participates, he is a fit subject to be kicked out of every decent circle, and banished the society of honourable men. This is my opinion.

I am alleged to have met the Senator at "dinner and supper parties," where all the mischief has been concocted, and the coalition perfected.

Sir, I have met the honourable Senator but once on a social occasion this session, where all parties met, Southern Rights, Whigs, and Democrats, and where an elegant and refined hospitality excluded every debatable and party matter.

Sir, I turn from this subject as I do from its author, with loathing, contempt, and scorn.

The identity of language, of sentiment, and other circumstances, plainly enough indicate the author. I have little doubt he is one of the editors of the *Express*. And I here pronounce, under all the responsibilities that can appertain to me, that he is a malicious slanderer, a mendacious calumniator, and devoid of all the essential principles, instincts, and feelings of a gentleman or man of honour—*that* editor of the *Express* I take to be now a member of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair cannot permit such language. It is altogether out of order.

Mr. MANGUM. I am aware, sir, that it is out of order; and I am done.

REMARKS OF MR. BROOKS, OF NEW YORK,

In the House of Representatives, April 23, 1852.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. BROOKS. I find a long article in the *Congressional Globe*, which undoubtedly has reference to me, and I rise to ask the indulgence of the House to make a personal explanation.

[Cries of "Agreed!" "Agreed!"]

Mr. STANLY. I object, unless the understanding is that members of the House involved in this explanation shall have the same privilege in reply. I want a fair field.

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman from North Carolina, I trust, will not object. I would not request this indulgence of the House, if it were possible for me elsewhere than in this House to make an official record of my explanation in reference to the speech I have alluded to.

Mr. STANLY. If it is the understanding that members of the House implicated in the gentleman's explanation shall have also the opportunity of explaining, I do not object.

[Cries of "Certainly!" Certainly!"]

Mr. STANLY. Very well; with that understanding, I have no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I did not believe that the time would ever arrive when I should be called upon to exhibit the bad example of rising, so to interrupt the ordinary course of business, as to ask, in a personal explanation, to refer to my own private affairs, or to speak of matters, which, if they interest members of the House, can have no immediate influence on public affairs or with business before it. It has been my pride and ambition, while I have been a member of Congress, to devote myself exclusively to public business, and upon all occasions, and at all times, whenever a topic was before the House, to confine myself and my attention, if I had anything to say upon it, to the discussion of that topic, and that topic only. My excuse now for this deviation in this House from the proper practice, and my excuse to my constituents is what I said before—that here, in this *Congressional Globe*, to go down to posterity, are recorded statements against me, which, if I make an appeal through a newspaper in the form of a card or otherwise, save at the bar of this House, it is impossible for me to send a like record down to those who may possibly be interested in my humble reputation, or who may wish hereafter to be accurately informed of what led to this attack upon me.

Before I go further, I will say that I have taken occasion in this House before to remark that I have but little respect for that chivalry which, before it assaults a member of Congress, carefully consults the lines of latitude and longitude, in order to direct its assaults, and which has billing, cooing tones for every man south of the Potomac, but rough and rugged bluster for every man north. I need not, however, have made this remark, in this case, because the speaker of this article before me is of an age and in a position to protect him from any personal assault of mine—from any assault here or elsewhere—for I should as soon think of vindicating myself in that way, from his remarks, as if I were assaulted by my own grandfather.

There are in this article, Mr. Speaker, various allegations, and the first one which I propose to notice, but which I have before noticed in this House, is, that a certain letter which appeared in the *New York Express* was written or indicted by me. That, in the most solemn manner, I have already denied [illegible] the floor of this House, and any further contradiction would be unavailing.

My position here as an editor of a public newspaper at home, and as a member of Congress, has often embarrassed me; and, upon becoming a member of the last Congress, I took occasion then publicly to say, that in political or personal matters, or in anything appertaining to persons, I would have no concern whatsoever, and be in no degree responsible for what was in my paper, because I foresaw, if I did not adopt that course, I should be holding personal relations with gentlemen of opposite politics or political relations, which, from the greater freedom of newspaper discussion than that which exists upon the floor of this House, would very often pain and embarrass me.

That course I have faithfully kept, and former correspondents, who have been writing for the *New York Express*—some of whom may be now in the sound of my voice—if called upon here or elsewhere, will, under solemn oath, testify that to them, upon all occasions, I have said, "show me none of your letters; let me hear nothing you may write; for I do not wish to know anything of the record you make of the proceedings in Congress." That order, which had previously been given, embarrassed me in the previous session of Congress exceedingly, because there were often personal attacks—I, perhaps, use a harsh expression in saying personal attacks—but personal comments upon members of the House, which, in my own heart, I did not approve, and which I would wish to correct if I had been at home. On account of this I felt it necessary to say to the correspondents of that paper, at the opening of this Congress, whenever there is anything in your letters in the nature of personal attacks or assaults upon members of Congress, before your letters go to New York, at least bring them to me, and while I will not be responsible for what you say, or a single sentiment you may utter, yet I will not approve of anything which may embarrass my social relations by attacks in the newspaper with which I am supposed to be connected. This letter, to which the honourable gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Stanly] alluded the other day, was brought to me, No inconsiderable portion of that letter I struck out. Indeed, all the personal matters I wished to strike out; but remonstrance was made to me that the rumours which were put forth in that paper were rumours which were in the mouth of almost every man—rumours, of course, but the existence of which I could not deny in the form they were stated. The letter went before the public; and but yesterday, or the day before yesterday, I disclaimed all personal responsibility for its statements, facts, or allegations.

There is also connected with this letter an editorial article, said to have been written by me. This editorial article bears evidence upon its face, in mislocating the homes of members of Congress, that it could not have been written by me. And, to add to the strength of this statement, before God, I say in the presence of you all, that I never saw one word or one item of that editorial article, until it reached me in the *New York Express*, and I never read it in full until I read it in the *Congressional Globe*, reported here in the paper before me. These are the facts of the case, which I state fully and frankly. But it is said that there is a remarkable similiarity of language between that letter and the language which I used in the caucus in the Senate chamber the other evening. Having seen the letter, and having been fired by such of its sentiments as I felt to be just and true, it is but natural that in the warmth and excitement of controversy, I should have given utterance to the same thoughts in the same style; for the earnest, energetic language and indignant thoughts were such as deeply impressed me when written—and they were the language and the thoughts of many others associated with me. Amazement, wonder, astonishment, and passion have one common language; and, like "words that breathe, and thoughts that burn," spring from the tongue of every man when astonishing events occur. Hence the identity of thought. This accounts for it, and nothing more.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are other insinuations in this article of the *Congressional Globe* in the main amusing, though enough insulting; and the first is that I am no gentleman. No gentlemen! Well, that would indeed be a severe verdict against my reputation if the person who renders it was some Beau Brummel, the head of some fashionably constituted board which had a right to pass upon what constitutes gentility, and to adjust the qualities and character of a gentleman. There is nothing on earth more difficult to describe—though every one has the idea in his mind—the *beau ideal* of what constitutes a gentlemen; but when you approach the language of definition of what constitutes gentility, there is nothing upon which mankind will more disagree. But as to what constitutes not a gentlemen, there is really very little difference of opinion among mankind; and all the world will agree in saying that he who comes fresh from the purlieus of Billingsgate, or from the Bacchanalian orgies of some midnight revel, and vomits forth his bile in an American Senate against an associate member of Congress in another House, is no gentleman.

And there is yet another allegation against me, Mr. Speaker, which descends, indeed, to low-water mark, and becomes amusing enough, if for nothing else, at least for its originality. I have had during a long political life many, very many, astonishishing insinuations directed against me, both in my public and my private relations; but this I am about to state bears off the palm in freshness and novelty. It has been alleged that much of my political action has been affected by the fact that in my more youthful days it was my misfortune (or fortune, rather) to suffer from that common frailty of youth, the loss of my heart, but alas! on the wrong side of the Potomac, and so have become allied to the South by matrimonial connection. That certainly was a very grave crime, and I plead guilty to the charge uttered against me, and which continues to be uttered against me in the northern States. But a charge of far higher importance is made against me now, that I am the owner of a carriage, or that I roll in luxury, with liveried servants in the streets of the metropolis. The author of this charge has undoubtedly mistaken the carriage of another member of Congress, who sometimes kindly gives me a ride, for mine; for his imagination has invested a commonclad driver with a livery. Such are my simple habits and tastes, that I have never been in the carriage to which he alludes but two or three times in my life: for I much prefer, when I can get the time, walking to riding to the Capitol. But what if I had liveried servants, and own up to the mighty fact? Well, sir, I had rather be driven by a negro in livery than, a southern man, be the liveried coachman of northern Abolitionists driving an Abolition team for the presidency [applause].

Such trifles as these, however, Mr. Speaker, could not have strung into print such a jewelry of words as I have before me. There must have been some other provocation than what appears here in this letter of the *New York Express*, or its editorial article. I know full well what it was. It was the remarks which I made in the other end of the Capitol a few evenings since—remarks which could have no effect out of that place, and were, therefore, innoxious, because no reporters were present, and because they could not go forth to the country from the secrecy of that chamber. But when like sentiment and similar ideas were published elsewhere, naturally enough to those who felt themselves hurt within doors, became outrageous when these ideas got out, and they felt it necessary to rise up, and, if possible, to overawe me and break me down as a public man. Sir, it will require much more than this fulmination to overawe me in the discharge of my public duties, or to make me neglect, at all times, and upon all occasions, fearlessly to utter my sentiments of public measures and public men. But the great cause of this onset upon me comes, I repeat, from what I said in the other wing of the Capitol. I, then and there, implored the presiding officer of that convocation—if he was about to surrender me, to surrender me and such as act with me as prisoners of war—that we should have the soldier's honour of being shot, and not be strung up on a gallows erected by executioners educated at Christiana or Syracuse—that when the halter was about my neck, I should be taken by white men to the execution ground, and not be dragged there by ropes in African hands. Thus much in reply to what I believe really prompts this assault upon me.

One word more before I sit down in justice to my Southern Whig associates, who may have misunderstood what I said here the other day in the House, amid numerous interruptions, to the effect that the Southern Whig column faltered or wavered, and that was the reason why Whig northern national men were depressed, and why they staggered, and why there was an apparent change from the action of the old Whig caucus to the record of the votes made in this House. I did not mean that the whole column faltered or wavered, or any part of it, beyond the first shock felt when its chosen head gave himself up, and us Northern national Whigs, without stipulation or condition, as set forth in a certain speech in the United States Senate. He has been captured and taken by the enemy, and is now in their possession; but—and I say it with delight—so far as I know now, no Southern Whig of the column wavers, but all are true and faithful to the constitution, and to the northern men who were connected with them in the hour of trial. If there has been any misconstruction as regards that sentiment, I withdraw it freely as to all of them. After that trying scene which occurred the other night, in the other wing of the Capitol, when the great body of the South felt it necessary to separate from us Northern Whigs, the sentiment of every Southern Whig who remained behind, and opened his mouth to speak, was that northern men should be protected, and that the pledges of the Compromise should be fully sustained, and that no candidate for the presidency should be put forth who would not come out for the finality of these measures, and who would not stand recorded for their finality too.

Am I not right in this announcement of a general Southern Whig public sentiment? It was due to us, northern men, that we should have such support from them; for in that terrible hour of trial here, two sessions ago, our services were necessary for them, and they were given to them freely, with the implied, if not expressed understanding, that they would protect us to the extent of their ability. Ever since that, we have been hunted down in the North, as the Missouri Compromise men were, who acted with the South in 1820, under the lead of Mr. Clay, as we Northern Whigs acted under his lead in 1850. But one or two northern members of Congress who voted for that compromise survived the political shock of that day—nay, almost the whole of them were buried in their political graves. If, therefore, we feel unusually sensitive now, amidst the adverse public opinion about us in the North, we must be pardoned for our anxiety, as again and again we demand countenance and protection, in carrying out what a great mass of our people deem to be an odious provision of the constitution, or in creating a sounder sentiment of respect for the execution of that instrument in its very spirit and letter. In demanding all this, with sincerity and energy, we demand but what is our right, and what it is your duty to give us. And if we can have it cheerfully, unitedly, we can support ourselves and our common Union upon the basis of the constitution. Without it, we must all become the miserable victims of fanaticism and political fury.

Mr. SACKETT. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House upon the private calendar.

Mr. SMART. I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union upon the special order.

Mr. STANLY. I desire to make a single remark. I have not seen the article in the *Globe*.

Several Members objected.

Mr. JOHNSON, of Arkansas. It is too late for gentlemen to object now. There was an understanding that this matter should be permitted to proceed.

Mr. STANLY. Gentlemen have not a right to object. I will leave it to the Speaker of the House. I have only a word to say.

The SPEAKER. When the gentleman from New York [Mr. Brooks] asked leave of the House to make a personal explanation, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Stanly] rose and said that he had no objection, provided, if the gentleman from New York [Mr. Brooks] alluded to any member upon this floor, that that member should also have the privilege of responding. The Chair certainly thought there was a tacit assent upon the part of the House to that proposition. The question arises now whether or not the gentlemen from North Carolina [Mr. Stanly] has been so alluded to in the speech of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Brooks].

Mr. SWEETSER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Rantoul] the other day proposed to make a personal explanation, but the gentleman from North Carolina persisted in objecting.

Mr. STANLY. I would rather have the gentleman from Ohio object to anything I may wish than not. I hope that gentleman will never approve of any effort of mine to do or undo anything. Have I the leave of the House to go on or not?

[Cries of "Go on, go on."]

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot decide.

Mr. STANLY. With all respect, I insist that the Chair must decide.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot decide, if the gentleman will allow him, that there was——

Mr. STANLY. I beg pardon of the Chair, but I insist, most respectfully, that it is the duty of the Chair to decide.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not intend to say that he could not decide, but the gentleman would not allow the Chair to say what his decision was. The Chair intended to say that he could not decide whether it was the order of the House, by unanimous consent, that the gentleman from North Carolina should be allowed to make a speech.

Mr. STANLY. Will the Chair state, then, what was the understanding of the House?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will again state that when the gentleman from New York rose and asked the unanimous consent of the House to make a personal explanation, the gentleman from North Carolina rose and said he must object, unless it was the understanding that if the gentleman from New York referred to any gentleman on this floor—the Chair thinks that was the expression—that that gentleman should have a right to respond. There was a general expression—perhaps not universal—of assent to that proposition, and the Chair is free to say that the gentleman from North Carolina might well come to the conclusion that he had, under these circumstances, a right to make a speech.

Mr. SWEETSER. If the gentleman from North Carolina will confine his remarks to the allusion which was made to him, I certainly will make no objection. He is perhaps entitled to that. But I shall object if he travels into a defence of a certain gentleman at the other end of the Capitol, who has been alluded to.

Mr. STANLY. I would rather the gentleman should object than not.

Mr. SWEETSER. If the gentleman from North Carolina invites me to object, I will do it. [Cries of "Oh, no."]

Mr. STANLY. I shall not trespass long upon the attention of the House. I regret exceedingly the appearance of the speech in the *Globe*, which has been referred to by the gentleman from New York. I have not seen it or read it. The gentleman from New York has said nothing at all which calls for any personal reply on my part, and I leave it to the gentleman who has been assailed to take care of himself as he thinks proper, and as he can, if he pleases. He does not ask or need my defence. He would not thank me for attempting it, for that would imply he needed it. He has spoken in the Senate to my regret, for I deprecate all personal matters, both there and here. If he needs any defence here—as I have been sitting behind the gentleman from New York, and could not hear him distinctly—I call upon my colleague [Mr. Venable] who represents his district, to do it, or another colleague [Mr. Clingman], who sat immediately in front of the gentleman from New York, and who, I suppose, is on as friendly relations with the honourable Senator as myself.

Both these gentlemen [Venable and Clingman] have heard what was said. I only want to say this, that I deplore the existing state of things, and these charges and counter-charges against gentlemen in the Senate and in the House. I do not know where we shall stop if we begin to reply to newspapers. I wish to say but one single word, in all calmness, and without reflecting upon anybody. The only point in the speech of the gentleman from New York, which touched me, the other day—and which he generously withdrew this morning, if I understood him aright—was the idea that Southern gentlemen "wavered" upon this question of the Compromise acts. I felt hurt at what I thought was a charge of infidelity to the people who have honoured me with their confidence; and as the gentleman from New York has referred to a remark he made in the last Congress, of "cooing" tones towards Southern men, I will say that several gentlemen were refrained from replying to him in harsh terms, for the consideration that their previous relations had been friendly with the gentleman from New York, and that it was improper to indulge in the "fiercer" tones towards the gentlemen from his "latitude."

The feelings I speak of animated me. To accuse a Southern man of wavering in that respect, is to say that he is destitute of patriotism, personal honour and regard for the rights and interests of his constituents. No Southern gentleman could hear a remark of that sort without feeling his heart burn with indignation, as did the hearts of every Southern gentleman the other day. He has, however, made the *amende honourable* this morning, as I understand him; and on that point, therefore, I have no more to say.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him for one moment? I know he does not mean to say that I made that *amende* upon the suggestion, advice, or insinuation of anybody from the South. I do not want the idea to go forth that I was intimidated into it. I know the gentleman will do me justice on that point.

Mr. STANLY. I intimated no such thing as intimidation—not by any means.

Mr. BROOKS. I would not make even a just qualification, under intimidation.

Mr. STANLY. I did not intend to intimate such a thing.

Now, sir, a word in reference to one remark made by the gentleman from New York, and that was, that the "large body" of the Southern gentlemen left the caucus. If the gentleman had counted the Southern gentlemen who were present, and those who left, he would have found that he was mistaken in one point of fact. I think a majority of Southern members remained; that is my impression. I beg pardon of the House for having trespassed on its time, even for these four and a half minutes.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

*** *All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns should be addressed to* SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, *New-York.*

†‡† *Donations to the Treasury of the* AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY *may be forwarded to* FRANCIS JACKSON, *Treasurer, at Boston; or to* SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, *New-York.*

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, MAY 6, 1852.

American Anti-Slavery Society.

THE Annual Meeting of the American Anti-Slavery Society will be held at CORINTHIAN HALL in the city of ROCHESTER, on TUESDAY, May 11th, at 10 o'clock, A. M., and will continue through the two following days.

☞ Among the speakers and distinguished friends of the cause who will attend the Anniversary are Wendell Phillips, Wm. Lloyd Garrison, Samuel J. May, Parker Pillsbury, Abby K. Foster, Samuel May, Jr., Francis Jackson, Charles F. Hovey, Robert Purvis, and Oliver Johnson.

ROCHESTER INVITATION TO THOSE ATTENDING THE ANNUAL MEETING.

ROCHESTER, N. Y. April 22, 1852.

Editor Standard: Dear Sir—

The Anti-Slavery friends of our city earnestly hope there will be many present from our vicinity and from a distance to attend the Annual Meeting of the American Anti-Slavery Society, on the 11th of May. We propose to make arrangements, if possible, to find *homes* for those who come, and I am commisioned to say to *all from abroad* that if, on arriving here, they will call either at the store of Isaac Post, No. 4 Exchange Street, or the Insurance Office of Daniel Anthony, No. 9 Arcade, they will, if possible, be sent to places to be hospitably entertained during their stay.

Yours, truly,

G. B. STEBBINS.

THE HEIGHT OF IMPUDENCE.

THAT this American Nation is the most impudent that ever drew the breath of National life, we think we have proved to a demonstration, over and over again. Taking this for granted, we must also allow that it is fitly represented by the present Congress of the United States. A more unblushing set of varlets never blazoned their assurance to the world than now play their fantastic tricks in the Capitol at Washington. They, the creatures of an hour (or at best of two years, which is but a second in the lifetime of a nation), propose to fix the policy of the nation for all eternity! They proclaim that the Compromise Measures of 1850 are to be a finality! That they are not to be disturbed! Who invested these men with unlimited power over all future legislation? Who empowered them to say to the waves of American rascality, thus far ye shall go and no farther? Even the Omnipotence of Parliament has never attempted, at least for many years, to invest itself with the added attribute of Eternity. Lord John Russell came near being swamped long since by his claim of Finality for the Reform Bill of 1832, and one of his latest acts was to abandon the principle he then enunciated. Parliamentary Reform must be enlarged, by his own exalted concession, and has been deferred only by his fall from power, on another issue. And this enlargement must be accorded by whatever minister can retain his hold of the helm. The word "Finality" is a bye-word in England, as well as an abominable neologism. There is no limit admitted there to the progress of political improvement. But here a quantity of cock-fighting, dram-drinking, tobacco-chewing, bragging, debauched bullies undertake to pronounce a specific rascality, which is particularly to their minds, perpetual, sempiternal, a thing for eternity!

To be sure, the assumption is a political absurdity. It can be of no binding force on any future Congress, or itself, if it should change its mind. But it is none the less an impudent assumption, and an insult to the Nation, had the Nation any spirit left in its heart. It is equivalent to the things made saying to those that made them, what we approve you must abide by, forever. We are not your servants, but your masters. We have the power to bind and to loose, and we hold the keys of political heaven and hell. And who are these fellows? Are they Presidents for life, Emperors, Dictators, invested with absolute power for an indefinite period? They are mere temporary servants, not acknowledged masters; "*temporaries*," like Mr. Richards, not "*permanencies*," like Miss Nipper, in the household of our national Dombey, whom we call Uncle Sam. And yet these menials, hired by two years at a time, presume to dictate rules to regulate the affairs of the family as long as it shall hold together, as if they were its head instead of its footmen. The impudent lackeys! They are appointed to do certain things. They are hired for a specific purpose. They may do a vast deal of mischief in the discharge of their regular functions. But, thank Heaven, they cannot make their mischief perdurable. They may make Compromises and pass Fugitive Laws; but they have no power to eternize them. The gift of immortality is not theirs to bestow. They are but the shadow which the people cast. As the substance changes its form, the shadow must change its shape. As well might the shadow, which a man casts upon the wall as he walks in the sun, resolve itself to be a finality and a perpetual entity. As the man changes his posture, the shadow changes its shape; and, as he finally passes on, it flits after him and disappears.

But, still, though Congress be but a shadow, it most philosophically, as well as politically, argues a substance which projects it. The action of Congress denotes a foregone conclusion. It shows that the lackeys knew the minds of the masters who had sent them up to Washington on this errand. They would not have dared to do and say what they have if they had not had their masters with them. The insolence of their action, and the danger of it, too, lies in the attempt of an ephemeral body, like Congress, undertaking to establish permanent Constitutions of Government for the people. And the most threatening danger of all is, when the people consent that it shall be so. When the masters, instead of stripping their liveries over their ears and turning their evil servants out of doors by the shoulders, consent to the claim they make to lord it over the heritage they have inherited from their fathers. The assumption of petty politicians in Washington to have settled forever the questions with which Slavery had to clap a padlock on lips in and out of Congress, would be simply ridiculous and absurd, were it not for the reception which these pretensions met with at home. One would suppose, to listen to the slave-catching speeches at Castle Garden and in Faneuil Hall, and to the slave-catching sermons of the Deweys, Springs, Barretts, Tyngs, and their tribe, that the drunken Congress that insulted God and the human race with those atrocities, were a select Convention of all the wisdom of the whole country to establish a new, or to reform an old, form of Government! Their action was not to be disturbed, forsooth! Agitation should cease, indeed! What institutions, in this country, are not liable to disturbance, and that lawfully, we should like to know? Have we not a right to propose the establishment of a decent Monarchy, if we please, in the stead of the dirty Oligarchy that now lords it over us? And may it not be accomplished, strictly according to the forms of law? Much more, who is to hinder the change or repeal of any mere acts of legislation? And how is any change or any improvement to be wrought out, save by Agitation?

This insolence would not be endured for a moment in any other matter than the one in hand. Suppose a Whig Congress should declare a Protective Tariff an eternal irreversible fact. How would such a declaration be received with derisive indignation by all Democratic America! So, should a Democratic Congress resolve a system of Free Trade it had carried through with infinite difficulty to be a Finality—never to be reversed or modified—what unutterable groaning of Constitutional Whiggery should we not have to listen to! But when the stake of the game is office, power and patronage, when the game is one played with human beings for the counters,

> "The table, earth; the dice are human bones;"

and all that is risked is the happiness of millions of human creatures, much better worth than the blacklegs that make sport of them, and the consistency of our national traditions, then we can submit to any amount of imposition and effrontery on the part of our servants. And for the very sufficient reason that the imposition made is on other people, and the effrontery exhibited is only the reflection of our own brazen countenances. Just as the shopkeepers of Paris consent, not grudgingly, to the usurpation and insolence of Louis Napoleon; because, he represents their *ideal* of protection to counters and help to trade. Southern traffic and President-making are the two main branches of trade and manufactures, which our hucksters expect to be improved by this Congressional *coup d' etat*. The New York merchants, we understand, are complaining that the first item of benefit is very imperfectly perceived by them. And certainly, the Whigs, and, especially, the Webster fraction of them, have small ground of gratulation in view of the blessings it has worked for *them.*

There is one possible case in which this impudent Congress may impose upon itself. It may better its more than Gascon assurance—its more than Milesian impudence. It is the case which will test the true virtue of this finality. For, it is well understood that the Finality of the Compromises only extends as far as Mason and Dixon's line. It is the rights of Liberty only that are not to be stirred. It is the Agitators of Freedom, only, that are sought to be quieted. Should Slavery be introduced into New Mexico and Utah, and should they approach Congress with Slaveholding Constitutions in their hands and demand admittance; should California be cut in twain to satisfy the demand of the harlot Slavery, or should that stalwart babe be delivered up bodily by the harlot Trade; in short, should the whole Northern side of the Compromise be utterly demolished; our word for it, there will be no outcry against such a violation of that sacred compact—no indignant denunciation of an Agitation on that side. Nay more, we will venture to affirm that the Infallible Expounder, himself, for the barest hope of a Presidential disappointment, would humble himself before the people, acknowledge his mistake and return devout thanks to Heaven for the miracle which had reversed "the laws of physical Geography and Oriental Scenery," for the new Salvation of the Union! Thus it may be made plain that the age of miracles is not past; for what now happens to be the most stupendous height of Impudence may yet be brought low, in the presence of a still more towering audacity; and we may find that, here as in Switzerland, as we travel along in the path of our history,

> "Alps upon Alps and hills on hills arise!"

E. Q.

MURDER OF AN ALLEGED FUGITIVE.

THE Telegraph has brought us, within a few days, the news of another atrocity committed under the Fugitive Slave Law, at Columbia, Pa. From an esteemed and reliable correspondent, we have all the particulars of this tragedy, in the following letter. They are fuller than any we have seen from any other source, as the killing of a mere black man, who was supposed to have been a slave, is not an event of so much consequence as to require from the papers generally much more comment than is given to any ordinary item of news. Whether there will be any attempt to bring the murderer to justice remains to be seen. It has been stated that Gov. Bigler had demanded him of the Governor of Maryland; but this rumour, we presume, from what our correspondent says upon the subject, is untrue.

LANCASTER, April 2, 1852

MR. GAY—It seems that Pennsylvania is to be written down in future history as the great battle-ground in the conflict between Liberty and Slavery. We have just had another exemplification of the happy results of the peace measures. On the afternoon of Thursday last, the village of Columbia, on the Susquehanna river, ten miles from this city, was thrown into a state of great excitement by the report that a fugitive slave, in the employ of a lumber-merchant of that place, had been deliberately shot, while in the discharge of the duties of his calling, by a police-officer from Baltimore, who was commissioned by the master of the alleged slave to seize him for his especial use, according to the summary method laid down by our highest legislative and judicial authorities. From the *Columbia Spy*, now lying before me, I gather the following particulars, which are confirmed by all the reports we have of the affair, except those which came by the way of Baltimore.

Deputy Marshal Snyder, of Harrisburg, and a police officer from Baltimore, named Ridgely, armed with a warrant issued by the notorious and infamous Commissioner McAllister, of the former place (who, by the way, is a member of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in good standing), arrested the slave, whose name was William Smith, while he was employed in piling boards, in the lumber-yard of Mr. Gattlieb, Senior. Smith made some ineffectual endeavours to escape from the clutches of the scoundrels who had seized him, and while doing so, and in the custody of the officers, Ridgely drew a pistol and shot him, the ball entering the right side of the head near the ear. He fell and expired in a few minutes without uttering a word.

The officers then left, as they said, to deliver themselves up to the proper authorities, but, as the sequel showed, at least in so far as Ridgely was concerned, with a very different purpose, for he immediately made the best of his way over the bridge leading across the Susquehanna, and with all haste embarked in a train of cars which were just leaving for Baltimore, since when nothing has been heard of the rascal here, except through a missive from him to the *Philadelphia Ledger*, in which he endeavours to palliate the cold-blooded murder which he has perpetrated, and for which, though he may, and doubtless will, escape punishment for it here, he will finally be called to an account by a just and righteous God.

The statement which I have given is in accordance with the testimony brought forward by the Coroner's Jury, and may be relied upon, whatever gloss may be put upon it by a worthless and mendacious press, ever ready to present and falsify the truth in support of Slavery.

The general opinion here is that the Governor of Pennsylvania will not dare to demand the criminal of the State of Maryland, and the conviction is universal that even if he should do so, the Governor of that State will promptly refuse to deliver him up for trial. Our dough-faces go so far as to say (but it is not far for a dough-face) that Pennsylvania and Maryland are now fairly at quits. In the opinion of this species, in order to atone for the death of a man who was killed while endeavoring to reduce again to Slavery several of his fellow-beings who had an equal right to liberty with himself, it is necessary that one free-born citizen of Pennsylvania should be kidnapped, another who proceeds to Maryland for the purpose of restoring her to liberty, should be assassinated by night, and that an honest, labouring man, whose only crime is having fled from the benign rule of the patriarchs, should be shot down in broad daylight, because he refuses to return to bondage without a struggle.

But one of the most revolting features in the whole affair is the heartless apathy of the profoundly religious community in this region. The death of Gorsuch excited their righteous indignation to an exalted pitch, but the death of this friendless negro man scarcely causes the slightest disturbance in the current of society. "He was only a nigger." I quote the words of a church member who occupies a respectable social position in this city. That sentence is a clue to the whole matter.

I have deferred writing to you until I could procure the facts of the case from reliable source, but hope my letter will reach you in time for the next number of the *Standard*. Very truly yours,

H. W. G.

FRED. DOUGLASS AND THE ROCHESTER A. S. SEWING CIRCLE.

WE have no intention of entering into any controversy in relation to the respective merits of the old and the new Anti-Slavery Sewing Circles of Rochester, as we can not see that any is needed or even possible. The motives which prompted Sarah L. Hallowell to publish the card of the old Society, prompted us to copy it, and those we conceive need not a word of justification, or reply. As the new Society think differently, however, we have no objection to comply with the request contained in the following note, but doing it—as Mr. Douglass says in his appended remarks—'not at all as an act of justice, but simply as a matter of courtesy.' For Mr. Douglass' own sake we should never have copied his "remarks," but rather have suppressed them. The new Society, in thus giving their official sanction to his words, though they may divide with him the responsibility, do not alter the spirit and tone of his reply to the temperate correction of Miss Hallowell.

The Editor of the *Standard*, having re-published, in his paper of April 29th, a letter addressed by Sarah L. Hallowell to Frederick Douglass (which letter was first published in *Frederick Douglass' Paper* of April 22), is requested by the Ladies of the Rochester "Anti-Slavery Sewing Society," to oblige them by, also, republishing the comments on the letter in question, made, by Mr. Douglass, and published in his journal of April 22d. On behalf of the Society,

JULIA GRIFFITHS Secretary.

ROCHESTER, April 30th 1852.

REMARKS.—While we have no disposition to magnify this *mole-hill* into a mountain, nor to give to this inch the importance of a mile, it may, perhaps, be well enough to state, in reply, that the impression intended to be made by Frederick Douglass in the letter referred to, was, that in his opinion (and everybody has a right to an opinion), the "Rochester Ladies' Anti-Slavery Sewing Society" is an excellent Anti-Slavery instrumentality, and one which may be expected to perform important services to the Anti-Slavery cause by holding Anti-Slavery Bazaars, securing Anti-Slavery lecturers, and by furnishing the means for sustaining Anti-Slavery Conventions in this particular locality.

In commending the efficiency, and the admirable industry of this Association in its special work, i. e. abolitionizing the public sentiment of Rochester, the writer felt that he did but "render honour to whom honour" is due, without casting any discredit upon any class of persons, under any name or designation, who might be adding in "*more extended operations*" against Slavery. Hence he must be permitted to say, with all respect to the complainants, that he fails to perceive either utility or pertinency in their letter. It would be easy to point out many defects and inaccuracies in the document above; but since it really affirms nothing which Frederick Douglass had denied, and denies nothing which he had affirmed, the intelligent reader will see in this circumstance, ample corroboration of the substantial accuracy of the letter addressed by Frederick Douglass to the President of the "Rochester Ladies Anti-Slavery Society."

The publication of the letter signed by Mrs. Hallowell in this paper, must not at all be taken as an act of justice on the part of the editor, but simply as a matter of courtesy. He would not for one moment countenance the absurdity, that he had done injustice, in not mentioning the existence of a *body*, which had not deemed its own existence of sufficient importance to be announced to the public. He does not feel himself called upon to drag an Association before the public, which has not itself assumed a public position. This letter, signed by the Secretary, is the first statement of its existence which the "*circle*" has give to the public, and the editor of this paper must be pardoned, if he evinces a little surprise that justice to their friends, *and* "*a due self-respect*," had not sooner prompted the circle to make its "*existence known*." For awakening the circle to this high sense of "justice," and this "*due self-respect*," the editor ought to have a vote of thanks; for, judging from the past taciturnity of the "*circle*," its existence would perhaps have continued as formerly unknown to the public, but for him. It requires a very small grain of common sense to comprehend the spirit and purpose of the whole affair.—ED.

COLOURED SEAMEN IN SOUTHERN PORTS.—As in many other cases, the information which Anti-Slavery lecturers and Anti-Slavery papers have, from time to time, for years past, brought to public notice of the cruel injustice and unconstitutional character of Southern laws in regard to Northern coloured seamen, is beginning to have due effect. The principle of *quid pro quo* is one to which politicians are very sensible, and several of our contemporaries of the political press have lately had the boldness to question whether, inasmuch as anybody may be made a slave of, at the North, to oblige the South, it is asking too much that free Northerners who go South shall be permitted to remain so. Considering that that never has been the case, and that the only religion now thought worth having is, that we should believe the Constitution as the only revealed law of God, and that we should love the slaveholders better than ourselves, the only wonder is that somebody, beside the Abolitionists, has not before discovered that to imprison Northern seamen in Southern ports if they are not of the pale tint, and sell them for slaves, if they are not themselves able to pay the expense of their imprisonment, is not in accordance with all the articles of the popular "higher law." However, we must be thankful for things as they come, hoping to live long enough to look at the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution without laughing.

It must be confessed, however, that the late discovery of this unconstitutional conduct of the Southern brethren had been brought about by the aid of "Foreign Interference." The British Consul at Charleston, Mr. Matthews has done much to anoint the Northern sight, in the salve he has been using for Southern blindness. Great Britain seems quite determined to make it a recognised and fixed fact, that a British subject is a man, and can, by no possibility, be permitted to be made a slave of. The correspondence of Consul Mathew with the Governor of South Carolina was, so far forth, more than mere diplomatic correspondence, that it meant something. It is now to be followed up by something more. We quote a paragraph current in the papers of the week:

> IMPRISONMENT OF COLOURED SEAMEN IN SOUTH CAROLINA—MR. CONSUL MATHEW AGAIN.—The validity of the law of South Carolina, requiring the imprisonment of coloured seamen, who may arrive in the ports of that State, has at length been controverted in a form which will put it to the test before the judicial tribunals of the country. Manuel Pereira, a coloured Portuguese sailor, articled to service on an English brig which was recently driven into Charleston by stress of weather, having been arrested and committed to jail, Mr. Mathew, the British Consul at that port, has applied to Judge Withers, through his counsel, Mr. Pettigru, for a writ of *habeas corpus*. The Judge has refused to grant the writ, and notice of appeal has been given. The issue, therefore, has been legally raised, and there is every probability that it will ultimately be carried up to the Supreme Court of the United States for final adjudication.

If the British Government shall not be more successful in this attempt to get a decision of the Supreme Court on this question than Massachusetts was when she tried to do the same thing, the Minister for Foreign Affairs will probably have a question to put to some body at Washington. *Hinc illæ lachrymæ* perhaps, of our contemporaries.

A paragraph in the Charleston (S. C.) *Mercury*, of the 27th ult., though it does not promise that that State will open any way out of this embarrassment, shows that one other Southern State at least prefers to be discreet rather than valorous:

> THE LAW REGARDING COLOURED SEAMEN.—The Legislature of Louisiana, after full consideration of the representations that have been addressed to them, have repealed those provisions of their law which provided for the imprisonment of coloured seamen from abroad, and have substituted for this a provision allowing such seamen to land for their necessary duties with passports from the Mayor We have not yet seen the statute, and cannot say whether it applies to coloured seamen from the North as well as from foreign countries. In regard to the former, we should be decidedly opposed to placing them on the same footing as the latter, except where they are driven into our ports by stress of weather. But even in regard to them, it seems to us that our law ought to be changed on the principle of the Indiana and Illinois constitutions. Let coloured seamen from the North be forbidden to enter our ports, and let their introduction subject the vessel to a fine of a thousand dollars for every one, and we venture to say we should be no more troubled with the visits of those precious "citizens of Massachusetts." We shall publish the Louisiana statute as soon as we can get a copy.

SLAVERY IN CALIFORNIA.—The Petersburgh (Va.) *Intelligencer*, speaking of legislation in California on the subject of Slavery, confirms the intelligence we have received from other sources, and to which we have several times alluded, that notwithstanding the prohibition, according to Mr. Webster, of the system, within certain latitudes, by the Almighty, that it will probably be established in the new State. The Virginia paper says:

> A majority, we learn, of the Assembly is pro-slavery, and yesterday we were favoured with the perusal of a letter from one of our own citizens now in California, who states therein that he thinks the effort now being made to render California a slave State, will prove successful, and that, in the event of a failure, it will be endeavoured to make the southern portion, at all events, slave.

HON. JOHN P. HALE will accept our thanks for valuable public documents.

REPLY TO DR. PEABODY.

BY WILLIAM I. BOWDITCH....NO. VI.

PROVIDENTIAL CAUSES.

> "O, my friends, in sad earnest, sad and deadly earnest, there much needs that God would mend all this, and *that we should help Him to mend it!*"—THOMAS CARLYLE.

Having thus signally failed to show either that the Anti-Slavery agitation has been useless or mischievous, or that the change in public sentiment at the South has been owing in any degree to our misdirected efforts, Dr. P. proceeds to point out the causes that *are* in operation which, in his opinion, will result in removing Slavery. He asks:

> "Are there no causes at work to remove Slavery besides those dependent on human choice—Providential causes, wrought into the general tendencies of society? We believe that there are, and that they will finally raise the slave to the level of a free man" (Slavery in U. S. p. 10).

The first of these causes is, he says, "what may be termed the spirit of the age. It has abolished the slave trade. It has caused the powerful and prosperous to pay infinitely greater attention to the condition of the poor and wretched. And this spirit of the age, breathed in through all the thought and literature of the time, is felt and will be felt by the slaveholder as it is by others. It leads him involuntarily to pay more regard to the individual rights of the slave. Its influence is seen in the increased amount of religious instruction which the slaves receive, and in their generally improved condition in regard to the essential matters of food, clothing and labour. It is an invisible agency which cannot be shut out by State lines or laws; it penetrates into the mind of the master, and makes him familiar with ideas against which he may rebel, but which he cannot cast out; it kindles up new and inspiring hopes in the mind of the slave, and bears all on, with the sure progress of the tides, towards freedom" (ib. p. 11).

The abolition of the African slave trade *not* "dependent on human choice"! Until now, we have never heard it doubted that the world was indebted to the labours of the *man*, Clarkson, and his human associates, continued during so many years, and under so many difficulties, for the creation of that same public opinion, or spirit of the age, which compelled Parliament, first, to abolish the slave trade, and then Slavery itself. Now, however, it seems that causes *not* "dependent on human choice"—"Providential causes, wrought into the general tendencies of society" in England, and there *alone*, brought about the desired result! If Dr. P. thinks this, he must believe man to be a mere creature of necessity. If such be his opinion, it is not ours. If there be one thing more than another which seems to us *peculiarly* dependent on human action or inaction, it is the spirit of the age, or public opinion in all its forms. If all the good men in the world should suddenly cease their efforts to create or advance public opinion, Dr. P. would soon find that strictly Providential causes would not only never remove a single evil, but would support and aggravate a great many.

But, if the spirit of the age is thus all powerful against Slavery, we are bound to do all we can to advance and improve it; and if so, what becomes of Dr. P.'s theory that we are not responsible in the matter of Slavery? Without seeming to notice it, he not only destroys his own fundamental principles, but demonstrates the efficacy of *our* plan of operations, and our wisdom in undertaking, first, to regenerate public opinion in the free States. By some unaccountable blindness, he actually asks us to believe that the slaveholders are doing more than ever before in giving the slaves religious instruction, and allowing them more and better food and clothing, and requiring less exhausting labour, at the very time that their minds and hearts are hardening against the rights of the slave, and closing up against all thought of emancipation!

The second Providential cause is the Domestic Slave Trade!

> Whatever may be said morally of the internal slave trade, the result is a very obvious one. It is draining the northern tier of Slave States of its slaves, and transferring them to the South. As their numbers increase, unless the space which they occupy is also enlarged, their value will diminish. The black population will outgrow the white, and Alabama and Texas will exhibit a counterpart of that state of things which now exists in Kentucky and Virginia. It is by no means impossible that the time may come when white labourers will very generally leave the South, and white masters become absentees, till at length, as De Tocqueville supposes to be not at all improbable, a black kingdom shall have slowly and silently established itself on the shores of the Mexican Gulf (ib. p. 12).

We can hardly believe our eyes when we read thi

Utterly unfeeling as it is, Dr. P. cannot claim even the poor merit of originality, for, years ago, among other pro-Slavery divines, Dr. Joel Parker, of Philadelphia, expressed the opinion that the foreign slave trade afforded a beautiful illustration of what Bishop Hall calls "a perch in Divine Providence," and that God had a *design* in bringing the slaves to this country in the way He did! We commend to Dr. P.'s reflection the remarks of Bacon, that "it were better to have no opinion of God at all, than such an opinion as is unworthy of Him; for the one is unbelief, the other is contumely: and certainly superstition is the reproach of the Deity." Plutarch saith well to that purpose, "Surely, I had rather a great deal that men should say that there was no such man at all as Plutarch than that they should say that there was one Plutarch that would eat his children as soon as they were born."

Dr. P. cannot restrain his condemnation of the efforts of the *Abolitionists*; but the strongest expression of horror at the domestic slave trade that he can utter is, "*whatever* may be said *morally* of the internal slave trade" And this in an article professing to point out, *first*, the *evils* of Slavery! If he and his wife and children were slaves, would he coolly talk of the *drainage* of the slaves towards the South? But he says the South is in a sectarian bog! And how consistent is he in thinking that the same Providence which *abolished* the African slave trade, should now *favour* the inter-state slave trade, which Randolph pronounced to be so much worse! Perhaps, however, he thinks our Northern slaves are carrying civilization to their brethren of the South, as he thinks our freed slaves are carrying it to Africa! Not less than 35,000 human beings are, every year, torn from their homes, in the slave-growing States, and driven to the far South, at a greater sacrifice of life than that caused by the Middle Passage, not, as Dr. P. would have us believe, for any reason dependent on human choice—not because the speculators in human flesh receive annually some sixteen millions of dollars—but solely in obedience to a Providential cause, wrought into the general tendency of society, which "will finally raise the slave to the level of the freeman"! Dr. P. may believe this if he can; we repudiate the idea, as worthy only of a God that is worshipped by some of Dr. P.'s ideal savages or savages of the most degraded kind.

But how is the domestic slave trade ever to have the effect of "raising the slave to the level of a freeman"? The slave trade in Africa has done more than any thing else to degrade and brutalize the native Africans. Can, then, our domestic trade, the same as the African in its nature, and a great deal worse in some of its features, have directly the contrary tendency? It is impossible! It surely is a singular way to raise slaves to the level of freemen by trading in their bones and muscles!

Even if this fatal objection could be obviated, another very formidable one is stated by Dr. P. himself, namely: this cause has not prevented the slaves, in the Northern tier of States, from *increasing* 108,103 in the last twenty years. It is no very difficult matter, therefore, to calculate how long it will take before, from the operation of this Providential cause, the slaves will be accumulated at the extreme South "in one solid mass"

But suppose the effect of this cause was materially to reduce the number of slaves in the Northern States, the only result would be to raise the value of those slaves who were left; and would *this* have any tendency to advance the cause of emancipation? Directly the reverse!

The third Providential cause is the customary rights of the slaves.

> We have already spoken of the progress made by the blacks in civilization; we add, that as they become more civilized, they demand, and have conceded to them under the imperfect law of custom, a larger number of rights. It does not follow, because one is a slave, that he loses all the privileges of a human being. Whatever he may be in law, he is not in fact a chattel, nor is he treated as a chattel, but as a man. The word *slave* does not imply one invariable condition any more than the word *subject*, when applied to the inhabitants of different monarchies, means always the same thing. Nor does it imply that the slave is an outlaw. In this country, the slave is protected in important rights by the law, and in still more is he protected by that public sentiment which creates and gives authority to law. As he becomes more capable of freedom, although his nominal condition may remain the same, he is generally found to possess more freedom (ib. p. 12).

Even if this cause were in full operation, Dr. P. does not suppose that it alone would lead to emancipation. But no such Providential cause is in operation; neither the law nor custom protects the slaves in any rights. Dr. P. says "the slave is protected in important rights by the law"! We cannot conceive a greater mistake or absurdity than this, when it must be perfectly well known to any one who has examined the question of Slavery even most superficially, that no slave can bring a suit of any kind whatever, for any injury however great; and, with the exception, *perhaps*, of Louisiana, he is nowhere allowed to give evidence against a white man, no matter how great the outrage that has been committed on him. The *master* has his rights, which he may protect; but Dr. P. may as well talk of the legal rights of the horse or the cow as those of the slave.

Dr. P. thinks that custom, especially in the Northern Slave States, "*materially*" modifies the character of Slavery, though its name remains. If this be so, we shall certainly find this improvement exhibited in the condition of the 660,563 slaves owned by the professed Protestant Christians of the South.

Have these Christians anywhere advocated teaching the slaves to read that book which they themselves profess to believe can *alone* impart the knowledge of that narrow way that leadeth unto life? No! On the contrary, they wholly repudiate the idea, and content themselves with orally instructing the slaves in those Christian duties which will make them more valuable as articles of property! Even Bishops have gone so far as to justify Slavery from the golden rule, and demand obedience from the slave, and contentment with his lot, because Christ commanded us to love one another!

Where is the Christian Church at the South that has ever disciplined or excommunicated a member for separating, forever, husband from wife, or for obliging either or both of them to change companions? Not one is to be found! But you will find bodies of professed Christians who have declared such acts to be entirely consistent with Christian morality!

So long as these things are so, so long as you will find Theological institutions invest their funds in slaves and sell them at auction to pay their debts, as is the case at the South—so long as you find Churches, as such, putting up under the hammer a parcel of men, women and children, to be sold to the highest bidder, as is also the fact, we must beg leave to doubt the accuracy of Dr. P.'s statement that Slavery in the Southern States, in any of its most serious evils, is materially modified by the influence of custom.

The fourth Providential cause consists in some "anticipated changes which will do as much to break down Slavery, as the cultivation of cotton has done to build it up" (ib. p. 14).

> The introduction of the culture of cotton into the Southern States, and the improvements in the methods for its manufacture, increased the value of slave property, and gave an immense impulse to the growth of this institution In most cases, the great revolutions of society are brought about far less by statesmen and soldiers, than by what seem the almost accidental changes in the agriculture, commerce, or manufactures of States. The next change which affects the South is quite as likely to be unfavourable, as favourable, to Slavery. If the efforts to introduce the culture of cotton into Africa, Australia, or India, succeed, if it should be found practicable to substitute flax to any considerable extent for cotton, should some new fabric or method of manufacture be adopted, it might so seriously diminish the value of the unelastic labour of the South, that Slavery would be felt to be an intolerable burden (ib. p. 18).

These statements are altogether too hypothetical to be fairly entitled to rank in an enumeration of causes now in operation. If the efforts to introduce the culture of cotton in Africa succeed, as they have *not* as yet, and *if* it should be found practicable to substitute flax for cotton, as it has *not* as yet (though we sincerely hope it will), Dr. P. thinks it *might*, he by no means thinks that it necessarily would, render Slavery an intolerable burden—so intolerable as to bring about emancipation.

But all the virtue of these and the other Providential causes, so far as they have any, depends on human agency alone. Cotton cultivation in Africa will never succeed unless man find it to be for his *interest* to turn up the soil, plant the seed and tend the crop. No more would flax be substituted for cotton, unless man finds he can clothe himself cheaper. And in any event, what is to prevent slaves from growing flax as well as cotton? Probably Dr. P. thinks the invention of the cotton-gin was *not* dependent on human choice, and that Whitney, the greatest benefactor the slaveholders ever had, was Providentially cheated by them!

Dr. P. says:

> There are other facts of still greater significance, because they indicate that, throughout the country, there is a prevailing and powerful tendency of feeling and opinion towards emancipation. We doubt if its extent is at all appreciated. We are not conscious of the forward movement, because, like ships sailing on parallel lines, all move together. At successive periods between the years 1780 and 1804, seven States passed laws for the abolition of Slavery, thus anticipating, by many years, and at quite as great relative sacrifices, the similar action of the English Parliament in regard to the West Indies. From the Northwestern Territory, and at a time when no additions of territory beyond this were looked for by any one, it was excluded by the organic law under which the States formed out of this region came into the Union; and it should not be forgotten that this law received, with one exception, the unanimous vote of the Continental Congress by which it was enacted. Into a large part of the recently acquired territory it is not, and is not likely to be, admitted. And all this has happened, not accidentally, but as the result of settled and well-considered convictions. In the mean time, the foreign Slave Trade has been abolished; in several of the remaining slave States strenuous efforts have been made to prepare the way for emancipation; throughout the South, the question of emancipation is brought into perpetual discussion; the extension of Slavery has been limited; and at the present time, the legislatures of the various States, both North and South, show a disposition to promote the colonization of free blacks, or those who may be liberated for that purpose" (p. 14).

To prove that these causes are *now* in operation which tend to abolish Slavery, Dr. P. alludes to the laws passed for the abolition of Slavery in several of the now free States, between 1780 and 1804, and says "that in several of the remaining slave States, strenuous efforts have been made to prepare the way for emancipation. Doubtless, in several of the States, numbers of men have endeavoured to crush all Anti-Slavery sentiment, but so far as our knowledge extends, the *first* law, having emancipation for its object, has yet to be passed by any slave State!

He alludes to the *unanimous* vote passed more than sixty years since, to exclude Slavery from the North-western Territory, but does *not* allude to our *refusal* *now* not merely to do the same for Utah and New Mexico, but our express declaration that the people of Utah *may* admit Slavery if they please! He says, indeed (what there is not the slightest ground to hope), that Slavery "is not likely to be admitted" into those territories. But public sentiment on this point has degenerated, for our fathers in 1787 did not think it safe to leave *any* loop-hole by which Slavery could enter, whilst we positively *allow* its admittance!

He alluded also to the foreign slave trade, which was abolished more than forty years ago, and the act made piracy more than thirty years ago. But he does *not* venture on a comparison between the state of feeling which demanded the passage of those laws thirty and forty years ago, and the public opinion of to-day, which actually encourages a worse slave trade on our own shores, and even talks of going to war for its protection!

Dr. P. may think that our Anti-Slavery growth has been a steady one for the last sixty years, but the facts which he adduces to prove the position, go far to establish just the contrary. They point out the same melancholy *change* in public opinion, which Daniel Webster traces to the influence of the cultivation of cotton! "We are not conscious of the forward movement" so far as the South is concerned, because, taking the South as a body, it don't exist.

Dr. P. says:

> More important, however, than any of these facts, in the way of showing the tendency of things, is the number of *free blacks*. At the close of the Revolution, there were scarcely any in the country. The words, negro and slave, were regarded as nearly equivalent. By the last census, the number of free blacks, is 418,173. These, wherever found, have all been slaves or are the descendants of slaves. Those born at the North were emancipated by law. But of the whole number, the larger part—233,691—are still found at the South; and they, or their parents, and large numbers besides, who have left the South, have been liberated by the individual humanity of their owners. Where so many masters, in spite of the many hinderances in the way, have given to their slaves their freedom, a far greater number must be strongly inclined to take the same step. The laws interpose many obstacles in the way of any individual who wishes to emancipate his slaves; and public opinion, which, at the North as well as at the South, dooms those who are emancipated to the wretched condition of a subordinate caste, interposes more obstacles. Humane men, who are conscious of just and kind purposes towards those under their control, naturally hesitate long before they throw their slaves in their weakness and dependence, some of them young and some old, upon their own resources, under such unfavourable circumstances. We think that those at all acquainted with the South would say, that, in a multitude of cases, it is the humanity of the masters which causes them to retain their slaves in bondage. If, under these circumstances, so many are made free, it shows, clearly enough, not only how strong and deep is the sentiment which sets towards emancipation but that it exists in scarcely less strength at the South than at the North (ib. p. 14, 15).

And he concludes his remarks on this subject by saying:

> These circumstances, and others of a similar kind, show a steady tendency—not a casual spasm, but a tendency created by the industrial relations, the social theories, and the moral sentiments most characteristic of the times—towards the abolition of Slavery. We cannot doubt that sooner or later it will be swept from the land (ib. p. 16).

Dr. P. says "the tendency of things" in this country is proved by "the number of free blacks," *more* than by any of the other facts he alludes to. In the abstract of the last official Report of the Secretary of the Census (Dec. 1, 1851) will be found the following table of the increase of the free coloured population from 1790 to 1850 inclusive, giving the ratio of increase every ten years.

YEARS.	RATIO OF INCREASE.
1790-1800	82.2
1800-1810	72.2
1810-1820	25.25
1820-1830	36.85
1830-1840	20.9
1840-1850	10.9

With every thirty to *favour* his theory, so far from showing, as Dr. P. supposes, "a steady tendency—not a casual spasm—towards the abolition of Slavery," this table proves directly the reverse! The tendency towards emancipation now is not nearly so great as it was fifty years ago!

Perhaps he may think that such a table, relating only to the Southern States, will show a different result. The following table is mainly taken from the American Almanac for 1844, and shows the rates of increase of free blacks in Maryland, Virginia, North and South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, District of Columbia and Florida, from 1790 to 1850, inclusive, and establishes fully the same conclusion.

YEARS.	RATIO OF INCREASE.
1790-1800	85.
1800-1810	76.
1810-1820	26.
1820-1830	35.2
1830-1840	17.7
1840-1850	1 06

The increase of the free blacks can arise from only four causes, viz.: excess of births over deaths—emancipation—free blacks added by the acquisition of foreign territory—and persons really slaves, but passing as free. If we attribute the increase caused by the last three causes to emancipation alone, it will tell more favourably for Dr. P.'s theory than the real truth of the case. Accordingly, we shall consider that the increase has been owing only to emancipation and natural increase. It is also obvious that whatever may be the true rate of increase of the free blacks from natural causes, whether ten or twenty per cent every ten years, the deduction of this constant sum cannot vary the relative proportions of the number of free blacks at the different decennial periods. Accordingly, we shall disregard this question of natural increase altogether, and treat the table as if it showed only the number of emancipations in the slave States there alluded to.

It would seem to be clear, therefore, that the number of emancipations at the South have been decreasing pretty constantly for the last fifty years. Between 1810 and 1820 the number fell off nearly two thirds The establishment of the Colonisation Society, the great exertion in behalf of the scheme, with other causes then in operation, caused the number temporarily to increase between 1820 and 1830. But this increase was only temporary, for since 1830 it has gradually dwindled away, until now it must be very trifling.

The following table, showing the estimated amount and value of the cotton crops, every ten years, from 1791 to 1851, compiled from tables given in the American Almanac for 1837, and those appended to the last Report of the Secretary of the Treasury, very curiously shows how closely connected with this question of emancipation has been the greater or less extent of the cultivation of cotton.

Amount and Value of Cotton Crop from 1791 *to* 1851.

YEARS	NO. OF POUNDS.	VALUE.
1791	2,000,000	$750,000
1801	48,000,000	8,000,000
1811	80,000,000	12,500,000
1821	124,893,405	20,157,484
1831	276,979,784	25,289,492
1841	530,204,100	54,330,341
1851	927,237,089	112,315,317

The value of the cotton crop increased nearly three fold between 1800 and 1820, and in the same period the number of emancipations fell off nearly two-thirds. Between 1820 and 1830, the value of the cotton crop remained nearly stationary, and there being thus no great feeling of interest in the minds of the slaveholders to counteract the Colonisation scheme, and other causes which led to emancipation, the number of emancipations again increased. But between 1830 and 1840 they dwindled away again more than one-half, as in the same period the cotton crops were more than doubled in value; and between 1840 and 1850 have sunk to almost nothing in view of the again doubled value of the cotton crop. The obvious reason why emancipations have thus fallen off, is that masters have felt that their slaves were worth too much as cotton-growers to be given away, even to themselves.

We have no disposition to call in question the humanity of those owners who have liberated their slaves, but inasmuch as this humane feeling has been dying out for the last fifty years, we cannot believe with Dr. P. that "a far greater number must be strongly inclined to" emancipate their slaves, than have done so already. And if it be, as he says, "that, in a multitude of cases, it is the humanity of the masters which causes them to retain their slaves in bondage," we can only say, that our test of what constitutes "humanity" differs. We cannot conceive of a truly humane man holding a brother man in such a relation to himself, as cannot fail to secure, in the end, the degradation of the man and his offspring; for who can guard his slaves against the results which generally follow the master's loss of life, or wealth, or property?

We have thus gone through all the Providential causes which Dr. P. alludes to as being now in operation, and which tend, in any degree, to bring about the abolition of Slavery, except only Colonisation, concerning which we shall make some remarks in our next number. Of all these causes, which, according to Dr. P., are bearing us "all on with the sure progress of the tides towards freedom," and which are not dependent for their existence on human choice, one, the Slave Trade, *retards* emancipation; another, the customary rights of the slave does not exist; another, the contemplated substitution of flax for cotton, does not yet exist, and if it ever should exist, it by no means follows that it would materially injure Slavery—and fourth, the interest in favour of emancipation, instead of increasing or remaining stationary, has dwindled away almost to nothing, leaving the spirit of the age, public opinion—the peculiar weapon of Abolitionists—as the *only* really active cause now in operation tending to produce emancipation; and for the virtue of this cause, we are to rely upon *man's* efforts, in accordance with God's laws, and not upon any dim and delusive notion that God will work at all, if *we* are idle.

Notes on New Books.

UNCLE TOM'S CABIN; OR, LIFE AMONG THE LOWLY. By HARRIET BEECHER STOWE. *Boston: John P. Jewett & Co.*

A book which is so widely read as this hardly needs a notice from us now by way of recommendation; but, inclined rather to doubt its sterling Anti-Slavery character because it became so immediately popular, we chose—reversing Sydney Smith's rule for reviewing—to read the work, to correct what might be an unfounded prejudice. This we have done, and with the same absorbing interest which has possessed, probably, at least a hundred thousand other readers; and our testimony in regard to it, therefore, will not be the second exception—the first place is already filled by a literary paper of this city—to the universal approval of the public press.

It would be worth the while, were this the place, and were it our vocation, to analyze the influence which "Uncle Tom's Cabin" has exercised over the public mind. It certainly is not its merit as a mere novel, for as 'a work of art,' as novel-readers say, it is by no means above criticism. It is not without the faults of style, and sometimes baldness of plot, and want of skill in delineating character, which show the novice in the art of writing fiction. But such faults, which are shown almost exclusive in the story of her white people, and are therefore of the less consequence, are lost sight of in the charm which has given the book so strong a hold upon the popular feeling, and is exercising so potent an influence over the popular thought. And that, we take it, is the power of truth rather than the power of fiction. There are, no doubt, many sentimental fine people who will shrink from reading it, as they would from reading "SLAVERY AS IT IS," simply because they can not get away from its truth, and from the appeal which that truth makes to their own consciences. It has the power of a true story; its slaves are real slaves; their characters are real, living characters who have endured and so borne such sufferings and such trials as are here heaped upon them. We doubt if any body reads the book, thinks of it, or remembers it as a fiction, but very many knowing, and all feeling, it, in all its essential parts, to be absolutely and terribly true, invest its various personages with all the attributes of actual, living beings, and accord to them all the interest, pity, and admiration, which they would give to men and women so living, and dying, and suffering under their own eyes.

Such a book, at such a time, deserves to be called an inspiration; and it comes to thousands of hearts with all the force of a revelation. It reveals, for the first time, to many minds, some of the horrors and atrocities of the slave system, and to many others the true nobility, the power of endurance, the high religious character, and even the romance, which belong to the hitherto despised African slave. It is not that injustice is done to the slaveholders; for that has never been done them even by those who oppose them most earnestly; but that no injustice is perpetrated upon the slave; that his degradation is looked at by the light of his wrongs, and his sufferings measured by the measure of his manliness, and his strength of endurance. It is as a man, and not a thing only, an immortal being, with all human and many divine attributes, and not a mere chattel, not as a mere element in the body politic to be sacrificed to the aspirations of political demagogues, or to political welfare or political peace, that the slave is here brought before us. And as it is precisely this truth which it is needed now to impress upon the people, therefore we welcome so warmly a book which teaches it so distinctly.

It is almost invidious to find any fault where there is so much to applaud and to admire. But we wish that Mrs. Stowe had not led some of the most interesting and intelligent of her characters to seek a refuge in Liberia. It destroys, to our mind, in some measure, the harmony of her work; for it is not true that Liberia is a refuge to such people as her George and his wife, nor is their seeking it as an asylum a true representation of the feeling of their class. The coloured people, as a whole, hate and repudiate the whole Colonisation scheme as one for their redemption or their relief; and we could, in half an hour, fill our office with coloured men who, in the same time, could convince George that he was untrue to himself and his race in consenting to such self-expatriation. Were the author's personal knowledge of this class more extended, we think she would have placed this one of her heroes in the situation of some of those whom we might mention, and whom many of her readers will remember, both in town and country in the United States.

The book is for sale at this Office, and we commend it to general circulation with the same readiness, and much the same feeling, that we should that of an Anti-Slavery tract.

THE PHONOGRAPHIC TEACHER, BY E. WEBSTER. *New York: Fowlers & Wells.* Price 40 cts.

Phonography has become so universally known to the public as the best possible system of short-hand writing, that it would be idle now to praise it. Suffice it to say, it is, and has been for several years, generally used by the Reporters in Congress; all other systems having been almost entirely discarded. Mr. Webster's work comprises a full and lucid exposition of the whole system of Phonography, together with copious exercises for practice; so that, with the aid of this little book, the learner may, without the aid of a teacher, enable himself in an incredible short time to write legibly, correctly and readily, in phonographic character. The English and American Phonetic Council having just terminated their labours in regard to various modifications of the Phonographic Alphabet, Mr. W. has embodied in this book the results of their deliberations, with the necessary adaptation of rules, exercises, &c., making it of course now the most perfect elementary book extant. It is to be hoped the author will meet an encouragement commensurate with his perseverance and devotedness to the cause in which he is engaged; for he has been for many years a most faithful and efficient advocate and labourer.

Communications.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., April 29th, 1852.

Editor National Anti-Slavery Standard.

DEAR SIR: I read in your paper some weeks since a choice and edifying account of how one Philip S. White, a temperance lecturer, told certain vigilant Carolinians that he was free from all sympathy with Abolitionists—was a Southerner "to the manor horn." A correspondent of the *Liberator* has since told how said White figured in Maine as a Free Soil lecturer, in 1848, adapting himself, like an almanac, probably *to the latitude*; perhaps piously becoming "all things to all men," though in a sense that Paul, with his musty notions about bold christian manliness would hardly have comprehended. Now Mr. White figured as a temperance lecturer in our city and vicinity a year last winter, and thus presented another *phase*. Verily, if not a lunatic the man resembles the moon so far as changing his aspect goes. In a lecture here in Corinthian Hall, he declared earnestly that "War, Slavery and Intemperance," were the "three great evils" to be combatted and removed, and no sentiment he uttered was more applauded by his large audience; in a neighbouring town, the "three great evils" were spoken of with like gratifying success.

His cause here was such that certain temperance women, interested also in Anti-Slavery, were much pleased that he was so true to both these great reforms. However, since reading his Southern correspondence, copied in the *Standard*, they have decided with the rest of us that his principles were like Peter Pindar's razors, "*made to sell.*" Now it is, I believe, allowed that the opinions publicly expressed, of public men are common property. I have done my share in giving Mr. White's to that discerning part of the world, the subscribers to the *Standard*, and certainly none know better how to appreciate such a treat. However, Philip S. White will I trust be commended to the Union Safety Committee in your city; he deserves a reward at their hands, for he has made a sacrifice of his all, *of himself*; and, surely he who sells his birthright of *manhood* should have in return some mess of pottage.

It is not very probable Mr. White will visit our city again; but should he do so, the popularity he enjoyed here will probably be "sold and gone," buried with his consistency in the Carolina Swamps. Only by repentance and manly deeds can such as he regain a decent standing among lovers of truth.

Yours for consistency, G. B. STEBBINS.

ROCHESTER, April 29th, 1852.

Editor National Anti-Slavery Standard.

SIR: In my letter some time since in regard to the formation of the "New York State Anti-Slavery Society," I spoke of "the call for a "Festival and Convention," as signed by "several ladies, members of a sewing circle." In "*Frederick Douglass' Paper*" of last week, the editor speaks of the expression as wanting in respect for these ladies. Now nothing was farther from my mind—the mention of the call was only incidental; I did not then, neither do I now, think the expression exceptionable, but, that entire satisfaction may be given, will state, that the call was signed by nineteen ladies who form the "Rochester Anti-Slavery Sewing Society," an association formed last summer, the members of which conducted the Fair and appropriated over $200 of its proceeds to Frederick Douglas. Certainly I had no intent to speak of their efforts as unworthy of respectful mention. G. B. STEBBINS.

LETTER FROM UTICA.

THE FUGITIVE SLAVE LAW.

UTICA, April 23, 1852.

Editor National Anti-Slavery Standard.

MY DEAR SIR: Enclosed are two dollars, in payment of your bill received this day. I cannot consent to stop here, but feel bound to say that any one who has the *National Anti-Slavery Standard* for one year, receives more than two dollars worth. And even more than that: If it were read by all the voters of the State of New York, the public sentiment of the State would be very different from what it now is. The reason why this is true, is, that the people are "not so bad as they seem." They would not all come to see the truth at once; they would not be "born in a day;" but there is not a man in the State, who can *read* that paper for a year, and not be a better man at the end than he was at the beginning. And then how much better he will feel! If they only knew that, your list would enlarge at once. I wish they did, for I like to see other people happy. But there is no reason to complain. The cause of truth in regard to the rights of Man—both as to knowing them and feeling them—has made more progress during the last five years, than during the seventy before them. Not that the Truth preached during the previous fifteen years was not as well-timed and as serviceable as that preached to-day; we are now reaping grain from the seed then sown. If the Truth, that A MAN IS A MAN, AND IS NOT AND CAN NOT BE ANY THING ELSE, had not been preached, the Fugitive Slave Law would not have been passed. I was disposed to be very angry when they passed that law, but I am bravely over it. It will do more good to the cause of Man than a million of Conventions; more good than for Congress or any other body to have voted, for twenty years, ten millions per annum for the circulation of papers and orators against Human Slavery. It *proves*, that, as a People, we are not truthful; that we are not kind; that, above all, we are unkind to the poor and the ignorant; that we are cruel towards the weak; and that we do not, in fact, believe what we say, when we declare that the Rights of Man are from God, and that we believe at the same time there is a God. This is what we say, every day that the Fugitive Slave Law stands on the Statute Book. And what is more, we say it in words, not only—WE SAY IT IN ACTS. The confession of the American People as to their real characters is now on record; it cannot be blotted out. Now, my dear Mr Editor, the American People cannot stand this a great while. They are an intelligent People, comparatively; a proud people; and fond of approbation, and therefore, this is a load they cannot long stagger under. They have too much independence, firmness and pride, to vote the Declaration of Independence a humbug. They will not do that. And by that very pride, it is sure they will not many years, by retaining the Fugitive Slave Law, consent to wear the brand of HYPOCRITE. No *man* will say he BELIEVES in the Declaration of Independence *and* in the Fugitive Slave Law; for when we speak of a MAN, we always refer to a being with brains. So I say to you, blessings on the day the Fugitive Slave Law was passed, for it makes men investigate, and think and feel. There are thousands upon thousands who are alive to the wrongs of the slave, and to the folly of their masters, who would *not* have been so if the Fugitive Law of Sept. 18, 1850, had not been passed. Many of them would have believed, but for that, that the American People were in favour of Equal Rights. They now know it is not so. But what of that? Why, do something to convert them. A man who does not believe in Equal Rights, is necessarily an unhappy man, for his mental organization is out of that balance and harmony which God established when he created the human mind; and something ought to be done for him by those who know how pleasant it is to *feel* that the Rights of every human being are precisely equal to their own. All this is brought up vividly by the Fugitive Slave Law. It is worse than piracy, for piracy is not hypocritical. What pirate of the sea *pretends* to be a "Law and Order" man! It may be some of them do, but I never heard of a case. Now, if they do not, they are so much in advance of the land piracy provided for in the Fugitive Slave Law, and done under it, as that they do not add hypocrisy to robbery. e American People, continue to stand in such an attitude to themselves, to the world, to God! Only a short time, my dear sir. I am very respectfully.

Your obedient servant,

A REGULAR READER.

Miscellaneous News.

THE *Express*, evidently indisposed to stick at trifles, roundly asserts that

"*The Fugitive Slave Law is in the Constitution*, and the only way to get it out is to break the whole instrument."

——THE COAST OF AFRICA.—By letters from the British African squadron to the 19th of March, we are informed that Commodore Bruce *has entered into treaty with every native chief in the Bight of Benin for the abolition of the slave trade, protection of missionaries, &c.* The blockade is entirely withdrawn, except at Whydah, and there it will not last long, as Commander Forbes, of the Philomel, has gone to Abomey to treat with the King of Dahomy. The capture of Lagos brought about these happy results. The chiefs who six months ago would have killed any English officer who had the misfortune to be thrown in their power, now hail us as their best friends, swear the slave trade shall never be renewed in their territories, and desire nothing but merchant ships for legal traffic.

——MURDER AND SUICIDE.—A few weeks ago a young man named John P. Street went to Victoria, having in charge a mulatto woman. Some two weeks ago a gentleman came on from Alabama in pursuit of him, as a negro thief. Street had suspected pursuit, and left Victoria with the stolen woman a day or two before the gentleman's arrival; he was followed by some citizens and overtaken in Lavaca County, when he drew a revolver and shot the woman dead, and mortally wounded himself, so that he died in about two hours.

——THE wife of Michael Catt, a resident of Decker Township, in Indiana, was shot on Monday of last week, by her son-in-law, a Mr. Young, to whom she approached disguised as an apparition. Mr. Young had been previously conversing about the spiritual rappings, ghosts, &c., and it is probable was much excited on supernatural subjects at the time. Mrs. C., in a mood of merriment, showed herself to him, when he seized his gun and fired at her. The ball passed through her neck and occasioned death in a short time.

——THE *Evening Post* is good for the following spicy item:

GENERAL CASS.—Our Washington correspondent informs us, upon what he deems reliable authority, that Mr. A. O. P. Nicholson, of Tennessee, has a letter in his possession from General Cass, containing his reasons for not voting for the Fugitive Slave Law. He said he could not vote for such a law without the *Jury clause.*

If General Cass had any such good reason for dodging the vote on that bill, he ought to have the credit of it. He is too modest. It is ungenerous in Mr. Nicholson to keep such a letter to himself. Will not Mr. Nicholson please give us an opportunity of taking back some of the hard things we have thought, written and spoken, of the man who was going to be elected President of the United States without the vote of New York.

—Ah! 'that accounts for the milk in the cocoanut.' The Editor of *The Express* would not vote for the Fugitive Slave Law because, being already "in the Constitution," it could not be strengthened by enacting it as a mere law. He declined on the same principle that Mr. Webster refused to "re-enact the law of God." Now we understand it.

——MR. WEBSTER'S HIGHER LAW NOMINATION.—The New York *Mirror* says: "The Almighty has plainly nominated Daniel Webster for the highest office on earth."

If that be the case, Mr. Webster, we presume, will not solicit the nomination of the Whig party, as he holds it to be absurd to re-enact the will of God.

An exchange paper quotes the remark of the *Mirror*, and says it proves the truth of the following lines of Shelley:

"The name of God
Has fenced about all crimes with blindness."

——THE PRESIDENCY—ELECTORAL VOTE.—It has been virtually settled in Congress that both S. Carolina and California shall have a Member of Congress on their several fractions—the letter of the law giving it to Carolina and the spirit to California. This increases the whole number of Members to 234, and of Presidential Electors to 296, making 149 necessary to a choice—148 being a tie. The Electoral Vote of each State, under the New Apportionment, as compared with that of 1848, will be as follows:

States.	1852	1848
Maine	8	9
N. Hampshire	5	6
Vermont	5	6
Massachusetts	13	12
Rhode Island	4	4
Connecticut	6	6
New York	35	36
New Jersey	7	7
Pennsylvania	27	26
Delaware	3	3
Maryland	8	8
Virginia	15	17
North Carolina	10	11
South Carolina	8	9
Georgia	10	10
Florida	3	3
Ohio	23	23
Indiana	13	12
Illinois	11	9
Iowa	4	4
Wisconsin	5	4
Michigan	6	5
Kentucky	12	12
Missouri	9	7
Alabama	9	9
Louisiana	6	6
Tennessee	12	12
Mississippi	7	6
Arkansas	4	3
Texas	4	4
California	4	0
Total	295	290

We have marked in *Italics* the fifteen States that went for Taylor in '48, giving him 163 votes to 137 for Cass. The same States would now cast 161 votes, or 12 more than a majority. Illinois and Missouri each gain two; Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, Michigan, Mississippi and Arkansas gain one each; New Hampshire, Vermont, New York, North Carolina and South Carolina each lose one, and Virginia loses two. The other States have the same number of Members and Electors as before, and California is added to the number.—*Tribune.*

Receipts for the Standard.

From April 1st to May 1st, 1852.

644	Lois Tallman, Walworth, N. Y	$1 00
644	Lawson Adams, Marion "	1 00
633	W. R. Hallowell, Rochester, N. Y	2 00
622	Z. Cornwell, W. Walworth "	2 00
622	L. Stevens, Plymouth, Mass	2 00
653	David Joy, Northampton, Mass	2 00
653	Rev. Rufus Ellis " "	2 00
668	Wm. S. Bray, Mystic River, Conn	2 00
668	Joseph Watrous " "	2 00
670	Charles Maxon, Westerly, R. I	2 00
670	E. G. Peckham, Easton, N. Y	4 00
670	H. Wilbur, 2d, North Easton, N. Y	2 00
690	Mrs. Marshall, New York City	2 00
614	B. Harmon, Haverhill, Mass	2 00
624	S. Judd, Augusta, Me	2 00
645	J. Watrous, Jr., Mystic, Conn	1 00
621	Lincoln & Granger, Hinsdale, Mass	3 00
618	J. L. Haight, Nyack, N. Y	50
659	Wm. Pope, Harrison, Square, Mass	2 00
643	Hiram Putnam, Syracuse, N. Y "	2 00
653	C. J. Wright, Canandagua "	1 28
624	C. F. Winslow, Waltham, Mass	2 00
658	M. B. Johnson, Lynn "	2 00
624	P. R. Merriam, Ashburnham, Mass	2 00
624	Geo. R. Russell, West Roxbury, Mass	2 00
619	Thomas Howard, Washington, N. Y	1 30
620	J. R. Hall, Starkville "	1 12
637	F. J. Higginson, Brattleboro, Vt	3 00
676	Jane Turner, Bridgewater, N Y	4 08
624	Neal Dow, Portland, Me	2 00
624	Mrs. C. Sedgwick, Lenox, Mass	2 00
628	A. Fairbanks, Providence, R. I	2 00
625	Wm. H. Thomas, Portland, Me	7 51
624	Samuel Bowen, Thompson, Ct	2 00
620	John Whittle, Weare, N. H	5 00
628	Wm. A. Chamberlain, Gaylords Bridge, Ct	2 00
624	Bourne Spooner, Plymouth, Mass	1 50
624	Thomas Spooner " "	1 50
624	H. N. Spooner " "	1 50
618	L. H. Gifford, Easton, N. Y	2 00
624	W. L. Crandall, Syracuse, N. Y	2 00
628	Joseph Savage " "	2 00
624	Rev. S. J. May " "	6 00
624	L. Borden, Fall River, Mass	3 12
629	Miss Catherine Kendall, Plymouth	2 00
624	D. B. Gove, Weare, N. H	1 00
625	D. Hughes, Hampton, Ct	2 00
673	Mary Carroll, Hemlock Lake, N. Y	2 00
647	Phebe L. Thayer " "	1 00
647	S. B. Fowler, Livonia "	1 00
622	S. C. Webster, Pittstown "	2 00
624	Mary M. Hyatt, Hudson "	2 00
624	Maria Marriott " "	2 00
676	Mary Willard, Deerfield "	2 00
628	Nathaniel Mulliken, Lexington, Mass	2 00
624	Samuel Philbrick, Boston "	6 00
624	Wm. Dall " "	2 00
624	Miss Bradford " "	6 00
628	Enoch Hebard, West Randolph, Vt	2 00
626	Anna Alley, Lynn, Mass	3 00
624	Rev. C. Francis, Cambridge, Mass	2 30
624	Joseph, Congden, New Bedford, Mass	2 30
666	Greenfield Iden, Sherwoods, N. Y	2 00
		$143 90

DONATIONS.

Geo. R. Russell, West Roxbury, Mass	3 00
Geo. W. Lewis, Fredonia, N. Y	50
Deacon Seymour " "	50
W. B. Choffer, East Randolph, N. Y	50
Wm. Young " "	25
A friend " "	20
J. B. Tuttle " "	1 00
Mrs. Tuttle " "	75
Mr. Tattle " "	25
Mrs. Huntley, Ellicotville "	50
Dr. Coleman " "	1 00
S. W. Wakefield " "	25
Miss Wakefield " "	25
Mrs. Powers " "	2 00
Ira D. Hyde " "	94
Collection, West Randolph "	1 94
" East Randolph "	3 22
" Napoli "	1 00
" Ellicottville "	1 50
	$19 55

RECAPITULATION.

Receipts for *Standard*	$143 90
Donations	19 55
Total	$163 45

JUST PUBLISHED.

Complete in Two Volumes, Royal 8vo.

THE FARMER'S GUIDE
TO
Scientific and Practical Agriculture,
ALIAS, THE NEW AND ONLY CORRECT EDITION OF
"*STEPHENS' BOOK OF THE FARM.*"
By HENRY STEPHENS, F.R.S., of Edinburgh.

With an American Appendix, by J. P. NORTON, Prof. of Scientific Agriculture in Yale College, New Haven.

This work embraces every subject of importance connected with Agriculture in all its various branches, both theoretical and practical. "Its clear and copious details, the fulness and accuracy of its information, the completeness of every illustration, have, in an Agricultural work on practice, never been equalled." It is arranged under four separate heads, represented by the four seasons of the year—Winter, Spring, Summer and Autumn—and the notes of Professor NORTON are appended in the same order, adding greatly to the value of the work by adapting it to the soil, climate, growth, &c. of this country. The united labours of two such distinguished writers constitute this the most complete and valuable Agricultural work ever issued from the press. It comprises two large royal 8vo. volumes, and contains 1600 pages, besides 14 splendid steel engravings, and about 600 engravings on wood. The latter illustrate almost every implement of husbandry now in use; the various methods of ploughing, planting, &c. &c.: and the former, the domestic animals, the farm-steading, &c.

Letter from Mr. Stephens.

"REDBRAE COTTAGE, EDINBURGH.
"Sept. 30, 1851.

"MESSRS. LEONARD SCOTT & CO.—Gentlemen: I beg to say that your 'Farmer's Guide' is the only genuine edition published in the United States of America of my work, the 'Book of the Farm.' The edition circulating at present in the States, under the title of the 'Book of the Farm,' is taken from the first edition of my work, written ten years ago, which, in my second edition, I entirely remodelled, and in great part rewrote, adopting all the more recent improvements in the practice of Agriculture suggested by scientific experiment, and making it, in effect, quite a new book.

"I am, Sirs, your obedient Servant,
"HENRY STEPHENS."

NOTICES OF THE PRESS.

FARMER'S GUIDE.—The concluding No. of this work is upon our table, and we but repeat the unanimous verdict of the Agricultural press, in saying that it is among the most complete and reliable of the contributions to scientific and practical Agriculture. The arrangement of the work is convenient for reference, the illustrations beautiful, the language plain, clear, intelligible, and truthful. The work comprises two royal 8vo. vols. of 1600 pages, including 600 woodcuts and 14 steel engravings.—*Ohio Cultivator.*

We have received this highly interesting and useful, but, above all, very practical work. We know of no other Agricultural work ever published in this country which might compare with the one just named in usefulness and intrinsic merit in general.—*Buffalo Wool Grower.*

THE FARMER'S GUIDE.—This work is a rich mine of Agricultural knowledge, presented in a simple and familiar style, giving copious details of the best practice on English farms, and adapted to general use in this country by the judicious notes of the American editor. The intelligent farmer will find it very attractive reading. In the comparison between English and American husbandry, for which it furnishes ample materials, he may obtain many valuable hints for increasing the product of his own acres. The mental stimulus given by the perusal of such writings is quite as important as their more immediate purposes. * *—*New York Tribune.*

The work is elegantly printed on thick white paper, from the English stereotype plates, and is neatly bound in emblematic gilt of various styles.

TERMS:

When bound in Muslin,	$6 00
" " Sheep,	6 50
" " Roane or Imitation Morocco,	6 50
" " Paper covers (in 4 parts),	5 00

The work will be sent by mail, in paper covers, FREE OF POSTAGE, at the following rates:

To any post office not more than 500 miles distant from New York,	$6 00
From 500 to 1,500 miles,	7 00
" 1,500 to 2,500 miles,	8 00

GOOD CANVASSING AGENTS WANTED,
TO WHOM A LIBERAL DISCOUNT WILL BE ALLOWED.
LEONARD SCOTT & CO., Publishers,
No. 54 Gold st., cor. Fulton st., New York.

Miscellany.

THE
HARBOUR OF WORLDLY CONFORMITY,
AND WHAT HAPPENED THERE.

WHEN they ran into the Harbour and dropped anchor, which they did without any mishap, they were surprised at the gay and brilliant look of everything about them. The very vessels at the docks looked all as new as if they had been just launched, and had never seen the open ocean; and to say the truth, of a long time most of them had not, but had remained idle till the dry rot had got into all their timbers. By dint of a curious paint of great strength and colour, all symptoms of rottenness were concealed, and the hulks held together; and the inhabitants of the place had an agreement among themselves to sustain each other in this cheat, all things among them being in like manner gilded and superficial.

As for the King's own ship, it may well be supposed that by this time she looked black and weather-beaten. There, was, indeed a curious contrast between her weary, way-worn look, and old-fashioned rig, and the showy vessels in the harbour. The truth was, there was another extensive port on the other side of the Island, with commercial relations running to all parts of the globe, and a double railroad direct from that to this city, so that this harbour, being on the side towards the Celestial Country, was of late years almost disused, except for State occasions, and it was a thing extremely rare to have an arrival in that direction. The men of the Harbour proposed to Peter and John to have their own ship newly coppered and painted, but they refused. saying that they had no time for any changes which were not needful, and that they were only anxious to be forwarded on their voyage.

When they went on shore, they left the Ship in charge of Contrition and Sincere, with orders to be employed as speedily as possible in laying in what supplies were necessary. When their gig touched the landing, it was proposed to them at once that they should be rigged out in a new dress, and meet the Mayor of the City, who would be glad to do honour to the King's Flag; but they felt bewildered by the strange, suspicious appearance of things around them, and were not willing to spend the time requisite for this ceremony, besides that they found it was to be attended with a feast, involving an expense of money as well as time, in which they would not feel justified.

They determined to remain no longer than they could help, for the place seemed not at all like the last Harbour belonging to the King, in which they had rested. But it came to pass, as they went up and down the streets, that their spirit was stirred within them as they beheld the manners of the people, and especially some great enormities in the sale of two notable articles in the commerce of the place, Rum and Opium. They were so roused, that they could not help speaking boldly against these things, and in a short time they had a great crowd collected together to hear them. They said they were astonished at the sale of these things in any place that had been under the King's dominion. They affirmed that the traffic would bring upon them utter misery; and though it might seem profitable for a time, yet it was really neither more nor less than the slow murder of men's souls and bodies. They said it was clean contrary to the laws of the King, and that the people might almost as well set up for a liberty to deal in hell-fire, as a freedom to pursue such sinful and ruinous practices.

There was evidently a great awakening of conscience under these speeches, for their hearts were full and earnest, and the multitude could not resist the wisdom and spirit with which they spake (1). Nevertheless, some of the principal dealers, being exceedingly enraged at having their profitable business interfered with, took unto themselves certain lewd fellows of the baser sort (2), and having got a marshal with them (for the law of the place favoured them), they made an address to the people, among whom were many workmen of like occupation with themselves, to whom they said, Sirs, ye know that by this craft we have our wealth (3), and furthermore the whole riches of our Island are greatly increased by it and dependent upon it, so that the words of these new-comers are not only seditious and treasonable, as being to the reproach of the law of the land, which is supreme, but also greatly to our detriment, and contrary to every man's own personal interests.

Thus they worked upon the passions of the people, till the whole town was filled with confusion; and while the baser fellows threw dirt in the air, and some cried one thing, and some another, they seized upon Peter and John, and put them in *Bocardo* (which was the name of their prison) as disturbers of the peace, and also as guilty of treason for speaking against the laws of the Island.

The next day they had them before the high Court of the place, with a jury summoned, and deputies to implead against them; and there stood up to convict them a great man in these parts, whose opinion was wonderfully regarded on all matters touching commerce and the laws of the realm. The great merchants of the town of Worldly Conformity, and also of the grand port on the other side of the Island, made up a large sum for this man, that he might plead their cause valiantly, and put his whole heart in it; and indeed it seemed to delight him, for he went at it with great speech, alacrity, and energy.

He said that the doctrines of these men were disorganizing and treasonable, that they were opposing a law of the land, which law was supreme, and being once passed, must and should be obeyed, and being for the high interest and union of both sides of the Island. it should not be spoken against, nor was such a thing to be once thought of as that it should ever be altered or repealed. He said that the law was perfectly constitutional, and that under it the people of every city were bound to protect the dealers in Rum and Opium from all infringement upon and injury against their business. He said that this was law, the law of the land, and that those who went against it under pretence of what they called the King's law, were miserable fanatics. He then insisted, with great and strong words, on the unconstitutionality, and illegality, and inadmissibility of private men setting up their notions above the law of the land, under the pretended idea of the higher law, that exists somewhere between us and the third heavens, he never knew exactly where.

This seemed greatly to tickle and delight the sense of the assembly, and the orator was quite interrupted in his plea by the applause of the Court and bystanders; for, poor creatures, they were nearly all under the same blinding delusions that had for years prevailed in the place; but as soon as order was restored, he went on again, although there was one man who gave some disturbance by crying out every now and then, Great is Diana of the Ephesians (4).

As he went on, he said that all judicial opinions were in favour of the law of the land in this case, and that no man in the Island, whose income was worth thirty pounds a year, would stake his professional reputation against it. He said that therefore the opposing of this law of the land was treason; and here he looked as black as a thunder cloud upon the prisoners, and stamped his feet to give the greater weight to his reasonings; whereupon, being a big man and heavy, as well as vastly eloquent, the Court room shook, and there was a great sensation.

He then proceeded to ridicule the conscientious scruples of Peter and John, and of any who might be so far gone in their wits as to think as they did, and he made the Court laugh at the idea of such scrupulous consciences. He said they were the men above ordinances, who walked about like the man in the play, prim and spruce, self-satisfied, and thankful to God that they were not as other men, but had attained so far to salvation as to be above ordinances. That, he said was their higher law. At this there was great laughter.

Nevertheles, the man in his plea did not attempt to deny the immorality of the traffic, but stood for its legality, putting law above conscience. He said that the prisoners at the bar had with unparalleled effrontery accused the makers and upholders of the law, and those who pursued that traffic according to it, of setting up profit against conscience; setting up the means of living, while they ought to go for conscience. But he said that this going for conscience was just a flight of fanaticism, and the people of that worthy city must beware of any such teachings; for as long as there was a law of the land, and they became men of substance under it, in all their labours no iniquity could be found that was sin (5), no iniquity that was what the lawyers called *malum in se*. To put conscience against profit in such a case was a mere flight of fancy. It what we propose, said he, is right, fair, and stands well with a conscience not enlightened with those high flights of fancy, it is none the worse for being profitable; the matter of being profitable, he insisted, could not make a thing bad which is good in itself, if you and I, said he, can live on it, and our children can be supported and educated by it.

All this, and much more, he argued in the case, though it was worthy of note that he did not anywhere say that the traffic, which Peter and John had spoken against, was a good thing in itself. He stuck mainly to the argument that the law of the land was to be obeyed at all hazards, and must govern conscience, and that all agitation against it was treasonable, and must be put down. He said, moreover, that religion probably was a good thing in the main, but in politics it only made men mad.

Now the words of this great man had great weight with the whole Court and Jury, and when he had finished, the case looked black against Peter and John, and there seemed to be but little hope for them. Nevertheless, they were not in the least degree daunted, but having gotten permission to speak for themselves, rejoiced exceedingly in such an opportunity to declare the truth. Accordingly, Peter stood forward first, and said that he spoke for the King, and in behalf of the King's laws, which alone were supreme, and against which some of the statutes of late years passed in these Islands were in manifest opposition. He said that he would not undertake to argue the case anywhere but out of the King's own statute-book, and if this honourable Court did not know exactly where that higher law existed, by which all human consciences were bound, they were not fit to sit as judges in any cause involving any principles of morality whatever.

If they did not know, then it must be, said he, because that is come upon them foretold in the statutes of the King, Forasmuch as this people draw near me with their mouth, and with their lips do honour me, but have removed their heart far from me, and their fear towards me is taught by the precept of men, therefore, behold, I will proceed to do a marvellous work among this people, even a marvellous work, and a wonder; for the wisdom of their wise men shall perish, and the understanding of their prudent men shall be hid (6).

Also, he said, that the earth is defiled under the inhabitants thereof, because they have transgressed the laws of the King, changed the ordinance, broken the everlasting covenant (7).

None calleth for justice, nor any pleadeth for truth; they trust in vanity, and speak lies; they conceive mischief, and bring forth iniquity. They hatch cockatrices' eggs, and weave the spider's web; he that eateth of their eggs dieth, and that which is crushed breaketh out into a viper. The way of peace they know not, and there is no judgment in their goings; they have made them crooked paths; whosoever goeth therein shall not know peace. So truth is fallen in the street, and equity cannot enter (8).

To the law and to the testimony, said Peter, for if your judges speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them (9). Then he made it clearly to appear that the Statutes of the King speak plainly against unrighteous laws, as having no righteous authority. He repeated in their hearing the King's Statutes on this point, Wo unto them that decree unrighteous decrees, and that write grievousness which they have prescribed (10). Also, Shall the throne of iniquity have fellowship with thee, which frameth itself by a law (11)? But there was no need, he said, of any argument on such a point; it could be only time-servers and men-pleasers who would ever undertake to excuse men's wickedness by human law, or to justify the wicked for reward, and God will be a swift witness against such men. Moreover he said that it was an incontrovertible principle, clearly laid down, that WHENEVER HUMAN COMMANDS RUN COUNTER TO THE DIVINE COMMANDS, THEY CEASE TO BE OBLIGATORY; AND NO MAN CAN AID IN THE EXECUTION OR SUPPORT OF SUCH COUNTER COMMANDS, WITHOUT AIMING VIOLENCE AT THE AUTHORITY OF HEAVEN.

In the matter of the charge against them, he said he would detain their honours only so far as to read the King's Statutes on the point. Wo unto him that coveteth an evil covetousness to his house! For the stone shall cry out of the wall, and the beam out of the timber shall answer it. Wo to him that buildeth a town with blood, and establisheth a city by iniquity! Wo unto him that giveth his neighbour drink, that puttest thy bottle to him, and makest him drunken (12)!

He also quoted a more recent statute. That no covetous men, nor drunkards, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God (13). He then demonstrated that the traffic in Rum and Opium, though it might be for the seeming temporary interest of the City of Wordly Conformity, was just nothing else than the work of making drunkards, and that by the Statutes of the King it was in every respect illegal, inhuman, and unjust.

Furthermore, said Peter, all your talk about peace and union is but a covering of sin. For what ought to be the object of a union of these Islands, or of these great cities, save only the protection of every man's liberties, the redemption of every man from sin, and bondage, and misery, and the establishment of every household in favour with God and man? But if your union be founded on any bargain with the King's Wicked Adversary, and kept up only by that, then it is accursed of God, and cannot prosper. If it were the support and protection of Slavery that this union were pledged for, then you and the whole world would cry out shame; or if it were a traffic in slaves that your pretended articles of partnership bound you to support, then also the curse of God would be upon it. But is it a less monstrous defiance of God and his righteousness to pretend that your union depends on the infernal traffic in Rum and Opium, and, therefore, that the said traffic, being legalized, and becoming a great matter of state policy, ought to be sustained?

You dare to call it a flight of fancy, when we arraign you and all your pursuits, and your laws also, and your political expediencies, at the bar of God's law for judgment. It is a greater piece of fanaticism, and flight of fancy by far, for you to dream that you can throw dust in the eyes of God and man by your pretended profit and law as the guide of conscience. The fanatics in this case are those who worship Dagon, and affront the very presence of God, and the sanctity of his law, with the demand of a protection for their profitable idolatry. What are all your Islands, and all the commerce of them, in comparison with Freedom, Truth, and Righteousness? They had better every one of them go to the bottom, than be upheld at the cost of man's guilt and misery, and God's violated law.

And let me tell the honourable and learned Counsel, that as to law in the case, Caiaphas and Pilate argued in the same way as he has done, when they condemned the Holy and Just to be crucified. They said in that case also that there was a law of the land, perfectly plain and constitutional, and not to be spoken against nor repealed, and by that law he ought to die (14). They argued also that it was far better that one such man should die, than that their whole hierarchical union, and the very perpetuity of the State, should be endangered. And they said, that those who thought or spoke on the contrary side were miserable misguided fools, who could not conquer their prejudices, and knew nothing at all concerning the matter. But they are the fools in this present case, said Peter, who set man's law above God's, and who make mock at a religious conscience; they are the men in the play, above ordinance, who imagine a vain thing, and set themselves to take counsel together against the Lord, and against His Anointed, saying, Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us. He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh; the Lord shall have them in derision (15).

After this, Peter closed his speech with a strong and terrible passage from the King's Law-book, at which the faces of the people turned pale, and even the Court trembled. Wo unto them that call evil good and good evil, that put darkness for light, and light for darkness, that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter! Wo unto them that are mighty to drink wine, and men of strength to mingle strong drink! Which justify the wicked for reward, and take away the righteousness of the righteous from him! Therefore, as the fire devoureth the stubble, and the flame consumeth the chaff, so their root shall be as rottenness, and their blossom shall go up as dust, because they have cast away the law of the Lord of Hosts, and despised the Word of the Holy One of Israel (16).

Then John arose and spake briefly, and said that he should add but little to the argument of his brother, for that it was so plain a case, that he felt ashamed to argue it in any place lying within the King's dominions, and professing the worship of the true God; so plain a case, as they all knew, that we must always obey God rather than men (17). He would only remind their Honours that for disobeying the unrighteous laws of Nebuchadnezzar, the names of Daniel and the three Hebrews were had in everlasting remembrance, while those men who helped to execute those laws were themselves devoured in the burning fiery furnace (18). He would add what their Honours well knew, that the Slave Trade itself was once supported by law, and that in some countries on the globe there was still so much wickedness practiced under statute, that even Slavery was protected by law, a thing which all the inhabitants of the Islands admitted to be a sin, and that so clearly, that the law could not make it otherwise. He prayed them only to judge of this traffic by the same principles on which they proclaimed the iniquity of Slavery, and he had no fear whatever but they would condemn it.

Now these speeches, together with the heavenly deportment of Peter and John, produced no small effect upon the people, and made many among them wish that they had had nothing ever to do with this business, and others there were, who resolved to give it up instantly. But the Court had taken care to have a packed Jury, and thought they had made sure, in regard to a great majority of them, that they were not addicted to any flights of fancy about any higher law than that of profit and the land. They, therefore felt secure, and the Judge proceeded to give them their charge.

He charged them to hold close to their minds two considerations, the law, and the profit. He thanked the learned and honourable counsel for the important principle so powerfully and clearly laid down, that a business good in itself was not any the worse for being profitable. He said that he did not need to add anything to the cautions they had received against listening to conscience against profit; he was perfectly persuaded that in this enlighted city there was no danger of that.

He said that as to the evil of the traffic, it was clear that it would be pursued by some, and that if they did not pursue it, it would be worse pursued by others; whereas, if they kept up this traffic, they could do much to regulate the evil of it, and might, in time, bring it to an end. On a general consideration of benevolence, therefore, and their obligation to do all the good in their power, he thought the business ought to be sustained, or at any rate that good men ought not to be denounced for sustaining it. He said also, that being a partnership from an early date in the Islands, and some of them having entered into it on the faith of that article in the agreement protecting them in the said traffic, none in the community could be considered at liberty to disavow or withdraw from that article, but according to their compact were bound to sustain it. The very existence of their Union would be perilled by any attack against this law.

On a general review of the authorities, the Judge said that they fully maintained the point stated, that though a thing be contrary to natural right, to the principles of justice, humanity, and sound policy, yet, if any city or State see fit to establish such thing, and continue it by law, then we are not at liberty to hold that unlawful, and wrong, which the legislative power of the place hath pronounced lawful. As to the claims of conscience in such a case, and the question whether God's law or man's were to be obeyed, he would say, Obey both, and make no trouble about it. When there was power to enforce the law, and the community chose to pass it, then the will of the majority ought to be the settled conscience of every individual. But he trusted it was not necessary to enlarge upon this; they must remember that they were citizens of no mean city, even the town of Worldly Conformity, and would conduct themselves accordingly.

When the Judge had thus delivered his charge, he let the case go to the Jury, with a demand that they should bring in a summary verdict.

Now it happened, as the righteous providence of the Lord would have it, that one was drawn upon the Jury, an old man named Weep-in-Secret, who had been a humble unnoticed inhabitant of the place, and another man, a kinsman of the same, named Judge-Righteous-Judgment. These men had grieved and groaned a long time over the growing pride and declining piety of the place, and the worldliness and wickedness of the inhabitants. It might be said of them that rivers of water ran down their eyes, because the law of the Great King was so little regarded (19).

Being quiet melancholy men, they had not been challenged on the Jury, and so, with some others, escaped being set aside on account of their opinions, which the Judge never suspected. These men had taken a keen and lively interest in the trial, and when the Jury went out, could repeat by heart every argument that Peter and John had used, and every part of their speeches, with the meaning of them. So what did they do, but set themselves to work upon the hearts and consciences of the other jury-men, which they did also with much earnest silent prayer, after the example of Nehemiah, when he answered Artaxerxes (20), for they felt the honour of the King was much concerned in this matter.

And it was wonderful to see what success attended their efforts, for they so wrought upon the minds of the jurors, that at length they brought them to be quite convinced that it would be a great sin to condemn Peter and John, who owed no allegiance to the laws of the place, and had only been faithful to their Lord and Master. Also there was no great difficulty in proving the ungodliness of the traffic, the more because some of the jury-men had children rolling in the gutter because of intemperance, and that could not be reclaimed, because everywhere the bottle was put to them to make them drunken. So they were all brought to such a state, that at length their resolution was made up, and they set Mr. Weep-in-Secret as Foreman, who, when the verdict was demanded, stood up, and gave it forth in this form: GUILTY OF OBEYING GOD'S LAW'S RATHER THAN MAN'S, WHICH THEY OUGHT TO DO.

When these words were uttered, the Judge stared at the man for a moment, as one astonished, or who did not quite understand the meaning; then he became red in the face, as if he had been insulted, and he angrily told the Jury to go out again, and bring in a proper verdict, or they should be broken for contempt of Court. So they went out again, and concluded; and when the question was put, What say you, Mr. Foreman, guilty or not guilty, the Forman spoke up in a loud clear voice, NOT GUILTY.

Now this was a dreadful blow to the Court, and altogether unexpected, but there was no help for it; they had to discharge the prisoners, for they could find neither cause nor quibble whereby they might detain them. Moreover, the consciences of more than half the people that had witnessed the trial went in favour of Peter and John; and indeed the whole thing had been brought about by the King to help on a reformation among them, and it could now be much easier for any man to oppose the traffic in Rum and Opium, which some would gladly have done before, but that they had stood so much in fear of being proscribed and ruined for their politics.

As for Peter and John, they were exceedingly overjoyed, and thanked God in their hearts. But they went quietly and gravely out of Court, all the people gazing at them with a kind of awe and sympathy, that kept them from being molested. But they had had enough of the town of Worldly Conformity, and as they had no instructions from the King to detain their ship in that harbour, they would not abide there another night, though old Mr. WEEP-IN-SECRET entreated them so to do, telling them that bad as things looked, there were a few godly souls that would be glad to meet them. However, Peter and John said they could by no means be detained, for they felt anxious concerning the ship and the harbour, remembering what had happened to them even in the King's Islands of Peace. So they commended their friends to the care of the King, and bade them farewell, and good Mr. WEEP-IN-SECRET accompanied them the nearest way, past Time-serving Row, down to the vessel. Their ship had been warped by the men up to the docks, to take in some provisions, and they were glad when they found themselves again walking the dear old deck in security.

But they were destined not to get under weigh again without some little trouble. For the men, instead of anchoring, had merely moored the ship to the bulwarks of another vessel for convenience, not knowing but that it was staunch enough for a friendly grip upon them; and now, in casting off, by a sudden strain and wrench, before the Cable was thrown loose, the bitts broke away, taking the rotten timbers, and planking of the deck, along with it, almost to the water's edge, just as if the vessel had been made of dry ginger-bread. The men at first were very much alarmed, seeing what had happened, but as soon as they saw that the vessel would fall to pieces almost at a touch, and had only lain there painted up for a show, they could not help laughing heartily; and asking the Harbour-Master to send in his bill for damages, they enquired what he would take for a fleet of such vessels. They said they could mend the broken ship, but they had neither paint nor sawdust, and she would not endure spars of sound doctrine. They asked if all their shipping was of such material, and enquired how long it was since Hymeneus and Philetus had given them the canker (21)?

Then said Peter, Let them alone. Every man's work shall be made manifest, for the day shall declare it (22). The calf of Samaria shall be broken in pieces; for they have sown the wind, and they shall reap the whirlwind; it hath no stalk; the bud shall yield no meal (23). It shall be as when a hungry man dreameth, and behold he eateth, but he awaketh, and his soul is empty (24). In them is fulfilled the prophecy, Their root shall be as rottenness, and their blossom shall go up as dust (25).

There being no wind to carry them out of the Harbour, they were now compelled, as soon as they got clear, to put all hands in the boats, with sweeps, so that the work of getting away from that place was some of the hardest they had had in all their experience. Nevertheless, they were so glad to be moving, that they broke forth of their own accord, in an old song, whereat Peter and John were greatly delighted, and joined with them; and the melody was so new and strange to the people on shore, and it was so surprising a sight to see a vessel clearing the Harbour in that style, that they crowded down to the docks, and ran aboard their old painted ships to listen. The song they sang ran as follows:

O when shall I see Jesus,
And reign with him above?
And from that flowing fountain
Drink everlasting love?
When shall I be delivered
From this vain world of sin,
And with my Blessed Jesus
Drink endless pleasures in?

But now I am a sailor,
My Captain's gone before;
He's given me my orders
And bid me not give o'er.
His faithful word is promised
A righteous crown to give,
And all his valiant seaman
Eternal life shall have.

—From Cheever's "Reel in a Bottle."

1—Acts vi. 10.
2—Acts xvii. 5.
3—Acts xix. 25.
4—Acts xix. 28,
5—Hosea xii, 8,
6—Isa. xxix. 13, 14
7—Isa. xxiv. 5.
8—Isa. lix. 4, 5, 8, 14.
9—Isa. viii. 20.
10—Isa. x. 1.
11—Psa. xciv. 20.
12—Hab. ii. 9, 11, 12, 15.
13—1 Cor. vi. 10.
14—John xix. 7.
15—Psa. ii. 1-5.
16—Isa. v. 20, 22, 23, 24.
17—Acts. v 29.
18—Dan. iii. 22.
19—Psa. cxix. 136.
20—Neh. ii. 4.
21—2 Tim. ii. 17.
22—1 Cor. iii. 13.
23—Hos. viii. 6, 7.
24—Isa. xxix. 8.
55—Isa. v. 34.

THE SHELLEY FORGERIES.

THE London papers (remarks the N. Y. *Literary World*) furnish some further details of the Shelley Forgeries exposed in the *London Athenæum*. Mr. White, the bookseller of Pall Mall, who sold them to Moxon, gives this account of his purchase of them, introducing to the notice of the reader the "son of Lord Byron," who commenced in this city the publication of an edition of his "father's" poems, prohibited in London, and which stopped short at a second number.

"One afternoon, during the summer of 1848, a well-dressed lady-like young person called to know if I purchased autograph letters, as she had two unpublished ones of Lord Byron's to dispose of. I replied, that although I had been in business some twenty-five years, I had never purchased an autograph letter on my own account. The name of Byron, however, and unpublished, struck me as worth looking at, and after doing so, I made a purchase. Shortly after she called again and brought two more. I then questioned her as to who she was, where she came from, and how she obtained them. She said they were the property of her elder sister, who resided at St. John's Wood—that they had been left her by their father, a deceased surgeon, who had been an autograph collector, especially of the MSS. of these poets—having made a point of laying his hands upon all he could of their unpublished productions. She also said that he knew Fletcher, Byron's valet—had attended him professionally on his deathbed—and that Fletcher had given him some books which Lord Byron had left him, when he died in Greece. These books, however, and the Shelley Letters, she said her sister would not part with on any account—that she herself had never seen them, her sister having always kept them locked up. That the reason of her sister parting with them one or two at a time, arose from her unwillingness to part with them at all, which would not have taken place but from the circumstances of an agent running away with some rents, on which they depended to exist for a certain period. She said the reason her sister did not come herself arose from her being an invalid, much confined to the house. She continued calling from time to time over a space of several months, according, as she stated, her sister's necessities compelled her to part with these precious relics." Mr. White then describes a negotiation into which he entered with Mr. Murray for the sale of these MSS., who, having examined them carefully, and believing them to be genuine, gave a check for the amount agreed on. He then returns to the lady: "After she brought me, as she said, the whole of the Byron letters, the necessities and ill health of her sister still continuing, she commenced bringing the Shelley letters. After I had accumulated some of these, I wrote to Moxon, as a matter of literary interest, concerning what I was purchasing; and told him I should be glad to show them to him any time he would call upon me. On his calling and looking them over, he at once suggested what I had not thought of, namely, that I should make an offer of the private letters to the Shelley family." Mr. White appears to have acted on this suggestion, but his overtures were rejected by Mrs. Shelley, in the most decided manner, on two different occasions. An application was subsequently made to Mr. White, he says, by Messrs. Puttick and Simpson, wishing to know if they could treat with him for these MSS., as they were empowered to do so by Sir Percy Shelley; but this negotiation also fell to the ground. Mr. White then continues: "When the lady had brought me all the Shelley letters, she commenced with what her sister thought the most precious of all—Fletcher's dying bequest to her father of the Byron books. After she had ceased bringing these, which I bought without the slightest suspicion, as I am sure much cleverer persons than myself would have done, she told me there was an end of the relics." It appears that the lady subsequently sold Mr. White some other "manuscript books," which he sent to Messrs. Puttick and Simpson's auction-room, and on the evening of the same day, Mr. Rowsell, the bookseller, of Great Queen-street, who had purchased them, called on him to say that he had resold one of the books to a Mr. Byron, who had not paid for it, and that he (Mr. Rowsell) wanted to know where "Mr. Byron" lived. The mention of this person's name "for the second time" in the course of these transactions excited Mr. White's suspicions with regard to the lady, and when he saw her again he immediately accused her of coming to him with false representations, and told her what he had found out. "She made sundry excuses why she had done so—told me a great deal about her husband, his misfortunes, &c. I had repeatedly asked where her sister lived in St. John's Wood, but she begged I would not press the question, as her sister would much rather not have it known, from motives of delicacy. I was now, however, determined to know her residence, and sent a person with her in a cab, which she took to Judd Place, New Road, with a view of bringing her husband to me. He was, however, from home; and she promised to call with him the next day—and they did call—when he gave various excuses and reasons why he had preserved an incognito in the disposal of his MSS. and books. That he was writing the life of his father, a portion of which he showed me in print; that he had travelled all over England, France, Italy, and Switzerland, to collect autographs and relics of his father from persons whom he knew to possess them: that he had purchased a great many of the letters of Mr. Hodges, of Frankfort, and of Mr. Wright, a gentleman connected with the "Quarterly Review;" that most of the books had belonged to Fletcher, his father's valet, to whom they had been given at Byron's death; that the Shelley letters had been collected in various ways; some, he thought, from the Marlow box, and from various quarters, which I cannot remember, as it is now three years since. He gave me a written attestation that everything that I had bought was genuine, but he would not engage that they *should not be printed* in the life of his father which he was preparing. This must have been some time after I sold you the letters, and as we had no occasion of meeting after that circumstance from that time to this accounts for my not having told you of the last affair." Respecting the general belief in the genuineness of the (alleged) Byron and Shelley MSS., Mr. White says: "Mr. Hookham (Shelley's friend) had no doubt of the genuineness of these letters. Mr. Moxon (Shelley's publisher) not the slightest doubt. He knew they were in my possession from the time I first showed them to him, upwards of three years ago, until he sought them at Southeby's. The form-fellow of Byron's at Harrow, recently deceased, had no question about the Byron books. They were also shown to the accomplished son of Byron's tutor at Harrow, whose family have several relics of Byron, which they hold as heirlooms. If, therefore, you, as Byron's publisher, and Moxon as Shelley's publisher, had not the slightest doubt about these matters, why should I have felt any, who had never seen a scrap of either of the poets' writings?" The weak point of this statement, notes the *Examiner*, hardly needs to be pointed out There is no doubt that Mr. White was imposed upon; but after the imposition was practised against him, he had reason to entertain suspicions that all was not right, and those suspicions he ought to have made known to Mr. Murray and Mr. Moxon.

The *Literary Gazette* says of this affair: No small sensation has been caused in Paris by the discovery of the extraordinary forgeries of the Shelley letters; and the articles on the subject by this or other journals have been copied into all the Paris newspapers. The fact is, that the system of forging letters and manuscripts of distinguished personages is carried on to a large extent in that city; indeed, it is as much a regular branch of business as the manufacture of pictures by the great masters is in Italy. There is, we are assured, not a sale of manuscripts in the French capital—and nowhere are such sales more numerous—in which forgeries are not audaciously palmed off on the public by wholesale; and there is reason to suspect that gentlemen of position or who have gained celebrity as manuscript collectors, do not hesitate, for a "consideration," to allow false documents to be slipped among the real ones, and to be offered in their names by public auction. In Germany many similar frauds are practised with much success. Only a little while ago a gentleman purchased several letters purporting to be written by Luther, every one of which it now appears is a forgery. In Italy, too, the same nefarious system is carried on. We are assured, for example, that a great many papers said to have belonged to Torquato Tasso, and for selling which a Count Alberti was tried a short time ago at Rome, were undoubted forgeries, though some of the most experienced men in such matters declared them authentic. The skill of the forgers whether French, Italian, or German, and we may now add English, in concocting papers, inks, seals, and writing, is truly remarkable.

Spring.---A New Version.

BY HOOD.

"Come, *gentle* Spring! ethereal *mildness* come!"
Oh! Thompson, void of rhyme as well as reason,
How couldst thou thus poor human nature hum?
There's no such season.

The Spring! I shrink and shudder at her name!
For why, I find her breath a bitter blighter!
And suffer from her *blows* as if they came
From Spring the fighter.

Her praises, then, let hardy poets sing,
And be her tuneful laureates and upholders,
Who do not feel as if they had a *Spring*
Poured down their shoulders!

Let others eulogize her floral shows;
From me they cannot win a single stanza;
I know her blooms are in full blow—and so's
The influenza.

Her cowslips, stocks, and lilies of the vale,
Her honey blossoms that you hear the bees at,
Her tansies, daffodils, and primrose pale,
Are things I sneeze at!

Fair is the vernal quarter of the year!
And fair its early buddings and its blowings—
But just suppose Consumption's seeds appear
With other sowings!

For me, I find, when eastern winds are high,
A frigid, not a genial inspiration;
Nor can, like iron-chested Chubb, defy
An inflamation.

Smitten by breezes from the land of plague,
To me all vernal luxuries are fables:
Oh! where's the *Spring* in a rheumatic leg,
Stiff as a table's?

I limp in agony—I wheeze and cough;
And quake with Ague, that great Agitator;
Nor dream, before July, of leaving off
My Respirator.

What wonder if in May itself I lack
A peg for laudatory verse to hang on?
Spring mild and gentle? yes, as Spring-heeled Jack
To those he sprang on!

In short, whatever panegyrics lie
In fulsome odes too many to be cited,
The tenderness of Spring is all my eye,
And that is blighted!

MORAL COWARDICE.

Justum et tenacem propositi virum
Non civium ardor prava jubentium,
Non vultus instantis tyranni
Mente quatit solida;—neque Auster,
Dux inquieti turbidus Adriæ,
Nec fulminantis magna Jovis manus.
Si fractus illabatur orbis,
Imperium ferient ruinæ.

WHEN we turn our eyes to the garden of Luxembourg, on the 7th December, 1815, we behold a man in the meridian of life placed opposite a platoon of soldiers. His manner, his attitude, his mien, are all those of one habituated to command. He looks these soldiers in the face. Their arms are loaded, and ready to be discharged. They are raised and levelled. In an instant he commands them to fire, and, as instantly, he falls in death. He is a marshal of France—one who has mingled in the bloodiest combats, and proved his indomitable courage amid the thickest dangers of the field. It is Ney, designated by the soldiers whom he had led to death, "Bravest of the Brave." Whatever we make of war, whatever we make of military prowress, we cannot look on this crowning scene without mingled feelings of awe and admiration. It is at least physical energy, surmounted with that degree of intellectual coolness, that enabled its possessor to deport himself consistently to the end, and to die soldier-like on the terms on which he had chosen to live.

On the 7th of September, 1838, off Bamborough Castle, Northumberland, a very different vision meets the eye. On a rock far out among the Farne Islands, the fore-part of a large steamer is fixed—the after-part having gone down amid the roar of a thousand breakers. A few sufferers are seen to cling to the wreck, in momentary dread of being swept away by the mountain surge ever raging and lashing around them. From Longstone Lighthouse, at the distance of nearly a mile, they are dimly descried. Their peril is undeniably great; and as undeniably great would be the peril of any who should venture on that sea, amid these winds and waves, to attempt a rescue. Yet that rescue is attempted and achieved, under the prompting benevolence of one whose years, and sex, and inexperience in such dangerous enterprises, might have well excused so daring a venture. At the age of twenty-three, in an open boat, and accompanied by an aged father, Grace Darling placed life and all its earthly hopes on the hazard, when, a thousand to one, she is to perish in sight of her home. But the spirit of benevolence, energised and sustained by a bravery which no mere physical conformation could originate, urged her, like an angel of mercy, through the tumult of the waters, and the perils of death. Heaven crowned her errand of courageous kindness with renowned success; and placed her, amid the weakness of womanhood and the frailties of humanity, a brilliant monument of the moral magnanimity that here and there sheds a passing lustre on the history of man.

But that which constitutes the real courage of the virtuous is not confined to heroic deeds, whose applause is to be resounded from nation to nation. It is not that which is to be reserved for some felicitous occasion, or momentous opportunity, in the progress of our being. Courage, amid the moral movements of our existence here, is called for every day. And simply as we are able to move onward in the path of duty—undeterred by fear on the one hand, and unseduced by the smiles of temptation on the other—do we evince that that special quality of the virtuous is ours. It is not that we are called on to anticipate, at some future day, the fire and faggot of the persecutor, and to have ourselves braced up to that condition of valour which would smile at all the engines of torture devised by tyranny and malice. But it is, that amid the thousand little annoyances, and petty seductions to ease, to pleasure, to self-indulgence, that meet us daily, we be able to brush them all aside, and, with the sure and earnest footstep of men who are determined to advance, make good our allegiance to the monitor within—a conscientious obedience to the dictates of right. This is the moral courage to which we are called, as the liege and loyal subjects of duty. Not merely to bid defiance to the shot of the musketeers, or smile at the angry violence of old ocean's main; not merely to walk with imperturbable peace amid the roar of heaven's artillery, or feel undismayed amid an earthquake's groans; but to be quiet, and peaceful, and undistracted in the midst of all the insignificant trifles which either, through the medium of timidity or sensual enjoyment, tempt us to disown our allegiance to the right. This is the moral bravery to which, as Christian men, we are daily and hourly called.

Here, however, it is that the weakness of humanity presents one of its most displeasing and humiliating aspects. Instead of that moral courage that would render it leal to every opinion that is felt to be true, and leal to every dictate of duty that is felt to be right, how frequently is it that men sneak through life under such a spirit of cowardice as will scarcely allow them to assert that any opinion is their own, if it contradicts what is generally received; or that any custom is no longer theirs, if it were to go in the face of established usage. We speak not of the myriads whose vocation it may not be to originate, by personal, individual thought, any opinion which is adverse to the current opinion in which it is their doom to live and to die. We speak not of men to whom Providence has given a stomach and arms with scarcely more of opportunity in life than to labour with the one in order to meet the pressing necessities of the other. These, in general, take the complexion and tone of the prevailing prejudices in the midst of which their being has been destined to live. But we speak of those whose awakened faculties give sign within that some popular delusion is no longer a delusion of theirs; or that some sectional or local prejudice is no longer confided in, as if it were the utterance of universal truth to them. Such men are everywhere to be found, who, standing ahead of the old local laws and maxims of their tribe and class, and seeing a deal farther than the pale that circumscribes the gin-horse believers who trudge within, are yet fain, notwithstanding, to act practically on the advice of Lear—

"Get the glass eyes, [illegible], like a scurvy politician,
Seem to see the things thou dost not."

What ineffable cowardice! what intellectual poltroonery! what mental debasement! next to the meanness of turning away from the light of truth, when its beams begin to flash across our mental horizon, and indicate the approach of the "star of day," is that of voluntarily putting the lighted candle under a bushel, or striving to act as if the light that is in us were darkness. What treason against the reign of a sound understanding can overmatch that? What defection from the first and noblest uses of reason can claim precedence of that?

But the moral cowardice to which we now refer is not merely seen in the restrained or concealed action of the intelligence, as it instinctively peers towards the region of light; in calculating, with wary and adroit circumspection, the social limits to which candid and fair investigation may with safety adventure; but, above all, in respect of those social habits which custom generates, and which again themselves give life and dominion to custom. How frequently is it that, amid social movements and social modes of intercourse, men seem to accord with practices which, in their cool and deliberate moments, they cannot for an instant defend! We refer not to the mean arts of mere hucksters in the market-place, or of those who carry the huckster's meanness into the more elevated platforms of commercial intercourse; the plausibilities, evasions, and dexterous shadings of the truth which are used, so as to gain a larger percentage in the currencies of trade. We refer not to the deterioration of the moral faculties, either forced on, or submitted to, in order to become winning competitors in the race for public favour throughout the ordinary marts of merchandize. Look at what is seen sometimes in the select circle of convivial friends. A youth, whose training, or whose suddenly awakened thoughts, lead him to disbelieve in the safety of spirituous indulgences, which are but the too common source of gratification in convivial gatherings; perhaps he is alone in his convictions, not merely as to the inutility, but as to the positive danger of such libations of wine and of strong drink as are poured out on these festive occasion. The question is, Shall he make a stand? shall he submit to be jeered and laughed at, as prim, precise, puritanical? as adventuring the old path of a moral asceticism? as wiser than his fathers? or trying, he draw his feeble and impotent thread of momentary resolution across the blazing and burning march of all but universal custom? The struggle is the struggle, it may be, of a moment; but it is that of the best part of his being to arise and move with the convictions of duty. It is easier, however, to sit and to sip in semblance of good fellowship. It is easier to assume a seeming conformity than to dare the merriment and wit of wine-enkindled hostility. He blushes inwardly to himself, yet outwardly advances hand in hand with the friends of alcoholic exhilaration. We may pity, in such a case, the sapling pliability of youth; or eye, with sadness and dismay, the tyrant dominion of social usages, whose visage frowns into allegiance the native, instinctive, moral aptitudes of the soul. But, O! it is among the first and most potent lessons of moral cowardice. It is a deviation; trivial it may be esteemed, and not to be reckoned among the vicious obliquities of the mind; but it is a deviation whose course, when pursued sufficiently far, leads to the darkest abysses of vice. It is like making the first approach to rounding to angle of a lie, or turning the point of strict integrity in handling the property of others. The courage of virtue is to be truthful in little, that we may be truthful in much; to be strictly just in little, that we may be just in much. The cowardice of vice is, that we nibble in fractional deviations from right for the sake of present ease, in the hope that, when the day of courageous behests comes, we shall arise, and, with valorous decision, bid defiance to the seductions or menaces of evil.

But the moral cowardice, under the special aspect to which we have now adverted—and it is but *special*; the theme is one of wide and momentous interest in the region of practical morals—is not confined to the young, the inexperienced, or the unconfirmed, in moral principles or habits. How extensively is the fact illustrated in respect of many who wish to be regarded as the friends of the temperance movement! They see and deplore the enormous injury inflicted on society at large, and on multitudes of families and individuals, by existing intemperance. They are ready to confess to all that physiology, sanatory reform, economical improvement, moral and religious investigation, have established on this subject. Nay, they go farther, and wish to aid, and far as monetary aid is concerned, advance a helping hand; but, to break through custom, and abolish at once the social drinking usages, their bravery fails. They could wish these customs abolished. They sometimes think they ought to make stand; they have all but resolved to make that stand. But the social season returns, and the social conformity remains. What is the use of standing alone? and then, what a trivial amount of good one solitary Abolitionist can ever hope to achieve, in the face of friends, and of neighbours, and of all the ordinary practices of social life. It is to sacrifice without appeasing. It is to pay the forfeit of good fellowship, kindly greetings, and laughing, joyous convivialities—for what? a cold, an icy, if not a comical isolation. It is to become a kind of Don Aqua amid the established usages of Christian and unchristian life. Well, they say, let us pray and give a subscription, but as for the confraternity of the water-bibbers, practically we must be excused.

If moral cowardice is not there, it breathes not of the spirit of the men and of the women who have ventured life or died, rather than prove disloyal to the call of duty. It breathes not of the high spirit of daring that has ventured through burning deserts, or tempted the mountain summit crowned with eternal snows, or gone down into the bowels of the earth, or breathed the pestilential gale, when the voice of science, or humanity, or duty allured. And yet what avails the boldness of such adventures, if within the little sphere assigned to each isolated atom of the race, there is not presented, amid the calls of every-day duty, so much of the courage of virtue as will command a simple allegiance to known right in conduct? One in a million, or an age, is a Howard, or a Brainerd, or a Schwartz; but not even one in a million is freed from the simple heroism that binds him to known duty—in respect of which it is not "conscience that makes cowards of us all;" but the obvious defection of our lives from the simple, direct, and easily-comprehended dictates of conscience itself. There it is, in that little sphere, that too frequently stands inscribed the moral cowardice of men.
—*Scottish Temperance Review*.

COAL FIRES ABOLISHED!—Dr. Bachhoffner *may* prove the evil genius of the whole tribe of coal miners and chimney sweepers. There is now on view at the Polytechnic Institution "a new fire," patented by the Dr. and Mr. Defries, which may work a complete revolution in the calcined world. The process consists in substituting for coals in the ordinary grate, thin laminæ of indestructible metal, which being acted upon by gas, instantly becomes red hot, and exposes a large amount of radiating surface, securing a cheerful bright open fire. It is proposed to employ a non-carbonised gas, obtained from the decomposition of water, which has no unpleasant smell or injurious effect incident to the use of any other gas. There is a complete absence of smoke, dust, ashes, soot, and other annoyances which attend upon the present system of coal fires. It can be lighted at a moment's notice, and the material being indestructible, the only expense is that of the gas, which can be supplied at the cost of 1s. 6d. per 1,000 feet. The gas is perfectly clean, and gives a great heat, capable of being regulated to the greatest nicety. From experiments which have been made, the saving is said to be about thirty per cent. over that of a coal fire, the cost for a single one in a large sized room being about three pence per day. The discovery if sound, will at once relieve us of the injurious effects of smoke, either from dwelling-houses, furnaces, or factories. There is no reason why the atmosphere of the metropolis and other densely crowded cities should not be rendered as clear and uncontaminated as that of the purest country district. It is the intention of the patentees to form a company to carry out this invention, and to make application for an Act of Parliament.